Defoe's REVIEW

Reproduced from the Original Editions, with an Introduction and Bibliographical Notes by

ARTHUR WELLESLEY SECORD

Facsimile Book 1

FEBRUARY 19, 1704, TO JUNE 27, 1704

Of Volume I

Published for the Facsimile Text Society

By COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW YORK : MCMXXXVIII

OF THIS FACSIMILE EDITION, FOUR HUNDRED
AND SEVENTY-FIVE SETS HAVE BEEN PRINTED.
THIS IS SET NUMBER 137

COPYRIGHT 1938
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, NEW YORK
MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To WILLIAM P. TRENT

DISTINGUISHED TEACHER AND EMINENT
SCHOLAR WHO FIRST RECOGNIZED THE
IMPORTANCE OF THE "REVIEW" AND
WHOSE STUDIES CONCERNING DEFOE OPENED
A FIELD TO MODERN RESEARCH
THIS FACSIMILE IS DEDICATED

List of Subscribers

ADELPHI COLLEGE LIBRARY
AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF, BIERCE LIBRARY
AMHERST COLLEGE LIBRARY
ARKANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
BAILEY, MARGERY
BAKER, HUGH CHENEY
BALL STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE LIBRARY
BASEL, UNIVERSITÄT, OEFFENTLICHE BIBLIOTHEK, SWITZERLAND
BEATTIE, LESTER M.
BENDER, ALBERT M.
BERLIN, BESCHAFFUNGSAMT DER DEUTSCHEN BIBLIOTHEKEN, GERMANY
BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE, PARIS, FRANCE
BIRMINGHAM, REFERENCE LIBRARY, ENGLAND
BLACK MOUNTAIN COLLEGE
BOND, RICHMOND P.
BOSTON ATHENÆUM
BOSTON UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL
BOWDOIN COLLEGE LIBRARY
BREDVOLD, LOUIS I.
BROOKLYN COLLEGE LIBRARY
BROOKLYN PUBLIC LIBRARY
BROUGHTON, LESLIE NATHAN
BROWN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE LIBRARY
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
BUFFALO, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
BUTLER UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF, BERKELEY, LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA, THE UNIVERSITY OF, LOS ANGELES, LIBRARY
—— THE WILLIAM ANDREWS CLARK MEMORIAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, ENGLAND
CHICAGO, THE UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARIES
CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
CLAREMONT COLLEGES LIBRARY
CLARK UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY
COLGATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
COLORADO, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
COLUMBIA COLLEGE LIBRARY, DUBUQUE, IOWA
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

CONKLIN, GEORGE NEWTON
CRANE, R. S.
CROISSANT, DE WITT C.
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE LIBRARY
DELAWARE, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
DENISON UNIVERSITY, WILLIAM HOWARD DOANE LIBRARY
DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF, MARY REED LIBRARY
DePAUW UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
DRAPER, JOHN W.
DREW UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
DUBLIN, TRINITY COLLEGE, LIBRARY, IRELAND
DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
EARLHAM COLLEGE
EDDY, WILLIAM ALFRED
EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, SCOTLAND
EMORY UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN, LIBRARY
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
FROMMANNSCHE BUCHHANDLUNG, WALTER BIEDERMANN, JENA, GERMANY
GAY, EDWIN F.
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, THE, LIBRARY
GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF, GENERAL LIBRARY
GOLD, MAXWELL B.
GOUCHER COLLEGE LIBRARY
GRAHAM, WALTER
GRINNELL COLLEGE LIBRARY
GROVE CITY COLLEGE, LIBRARY
HAMILTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, KRESS LIBRARY OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
HAVENS, RAYMOND D.
HINKLE, GEORGE
HOLY CROSS COLLEGE LIBRARY
HULL, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, YORKSHIRE, ENGLAND
HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
HUNTINGTON, HENRY E., LIBRARY AND ART GALLERY
HUTCHINS, HENRY CLINTON
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
—— SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM
ILLINOIS COLLEGE
INDIANA STATE LIBRARY
INDIANA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
IOWA, STATE UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARIES
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, THE, LIBRARY
JONES, EDWARD H.
JONES, RICHARD F.
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
KECK, WENDELL MAGEE
KEELER, CHARLES B.
KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
KENYON COLLEGE LIBRARY

KILBOURNE, ELIZABETH L.
KNOX COLLEGE LIBRARY
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE LIBRARY
LAWRENCE COLLEGE LIBRARY
LEHIGH UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
LONDON, UNIVERSITY OF, KING'S COLLEGE, ENGLAND
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, MONTREAL, CANADA
MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
MANHATTAN COLLEGE
MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF, GENERAL LIBRARY
MILLIGAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF
—— SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM
MONTGOMERY, GUY
MOORE, JOHN ROBERT
MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE LIBRARY
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND, EDINBURGH
NEBRASKA, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARIES
NEWBERRY LIBRARY, THE
NEWTON, THEODORE F. M.
NEW YORK, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF, LIBRARY
NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, LIBRARY, UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS
NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
NORTH TEXAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE LIBRARY
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
OBERLIN COLLEGE LIBRARY
OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE LIBRARY
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, THE, LIBRARY
OHIO UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, CHARLES ELIHU SLOCUM LIBRARY
OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
OXFORD, THE ENGLISH LIBRARY, ENGLAND
PARIS, L'UNIVERSITÉ DE, BIBLIOTHÈQUE
PATTERSON, FRANK A.
PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE, THE, LIBRARY
PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
PURDUE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, BELFAST, IRELAND

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, KINGSTON, ONTARIO, CANADA
RADCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY
RICE INSTITUTE LIBRARY
RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
ROCHESTER, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
ROCKFORD COLLEGE LIBRARY
RUSSELL SAGE COLLEGE, JULIA PATTON LIBRARY
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
RYLANDS, THE JOHN, LIBRARY, MANCHESTER, ENGLAND
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
SAINT MARY-OF-THE-WOODS COLLEGE LIBRARY
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE
SCOTT, FRANKLIN W.
SECORD, ARTHUR WELLESLEY
SHEFFIELD UNIVERSITY, THE, LIBRARY, ENGLAND
SHERBURN, GEORGE
SMITH COLLEGE LIBRARY
SOUTH, UNIVERSITY OF THE, LIBRARY
SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY, LIBRARY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, ENGLISH CLUB
—— LIBRARY
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE LIBRARY
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, SULLIVAN MEMORIAL LIBRARY
TENNESSEE, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
TEXAS, THE UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
TEXAS STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN, LIBRARY
THOMSON, MARK A.
TINDALL, WILLIAM Y.
TORONTO, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY, CANADA
TOULOUSE, FACULTÉ DES LETTRES DE, BIBLIOTHÈQUE, D'ANGLAIS, FRANCE
TUFTS COLLEGE LIBRARY
TULANE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNION COLLEGE LIBRARY
URSINUS COLLEGE LIBRARY
UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
VASSAR COLLEGE LIBRARY
VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF, ALDERMAN LIBRARY
WABASH COLLEGE LIBRARY
WAKE FOREST COLLEGE LIBRARY
WALTER, ERICH A.
WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE CLASS OF 1909
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
WASHINGTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

WAYNE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
WEEKS, DANIEL RICHARD
WELLESLEY COLLEGE LIBRARY
WELLS COLLEGE LIBRARY
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
WESTERN ONTARIO, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY, LONDON, CANADA
WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
WESTERN WASHINGTON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, LIBRARY
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
WHEELER, CHARLES FRANCIS
WILLIAM AND MARY, COLLEGE OF
WILSON, GEORGE Z.
WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
WRIGHT, ERNEST HUNTER
WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF, LIBRARY
YALE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
ZIMANSKY, CURT A.

Contents of the 22 Facsimile Books

	Book
Introduction	1
Bibliographical Note to Volume I	1
Defoe's *Review*, Volume I	
Nos. 1–33, February 19, 1704—June 27, 1704	1
Nos. 34–88, July 1, 1704—January 6, 1705	2
Nos. 89–102, January 9, 1705—February 24, 1705	3
Supplements, Nos. 1–5, September, 1704—January, 1705	3
Appendix	3
Contents	3
Bibliographical Note to Volume II	4
Defoe's *Review*, Volume II	
Nos. 1–74, February 27, 1705—August 23, 1705	4
Nos. 75–127, August 25, 1705—December 27, 1705	5
The Little Review	5
Bibliographical Note to Volume III	6
Defoe's *Review*, Volume III	
Nos. 1–54, January 1, 1706—May 4, 1706	6
Nos. 55–113, May 7, 1706—September 21, 1706	7
Nos. 114–172, September 24, 1706—February 6, 1706/7	8
Bibliographical Note to Volume IV	9
Defoe's *Review*, Volume IV	
Nos. 1–54, February 11, 1706/7—June 14, 1707	9
Nos. 55–116, June 17, 1707—November 8, 1707	10
Nos. 117–175, November 11, 1707—March 25, 1708	11
Bibliographical Note to Volume V	12
Defoe's *Review*, Volume V	
Nos. 1–78, March 27, 1708—September 25, 1708	12
Nos. 79–158, September 28, 1708—March 31, 1709	13

BOOK

Bibliographical Note to Volume VI 14

Defoe's *Review*, Volume VI

Nos. 1–53, April 5, 1709—August 4, 1709 14
Nos. 54–108, August 6, 1709—December 13, 1709 15
Nos. 109–150, December 15, 1709—March 23, 1710 16
Edinburgh Nos. 1–4, 75, 87, 110, 127–129, 131, and 147 16

Bibliographical Note to Volume VII 17

Defoe's *Review*, Volume VII

Nos. 1–77, March 28, 1710—September 21, 1710 17
Nos. 78–155, September 23, 1710—March 22, 1711 18
Edinburgh No. 35 18

Bibliographical Note to Volume VIII 19

Defoe's *Review*, Volume VIII

Nos. 1–54, January 1, 1706—May 4, 1706 6
Nos. 69–140, September 1, 1711—February 14, 1712 20
Nos. 141–211, February 16, 1712—July 29, 1712 21

Bibliographical Note to Volume [IX] 22

Defoe's *Review*, Volume [IX]

Nos. 1–106, August 2, 1712—June 11, 1713 22

NOTE: A Preface by Defoe is printed at the beginning of each of his volumes except Volume [IX]. An Index by Defoe is included in the front matter of his Volume II.

Introduction

THE AUTHOR OF THE "REVIEW"

DANIEL DEFOE'S fame now rests upon *Robinson Crusoe* and his novels. But discerning readers know also of his importance in the history of economic and political thought and especially in journalism. The newspaper at the end of the seventeenth century was groping its way toward the metropolitan daily we now know, and much of what makes up our newspapers did not in Defoe's day get into the journals at all, but appeared in pamphlets, a fact of which histories of journalism will in the future take more notice. One of Defoe's great merits is that he extended the scope of the newspaper to include important new features. But the *Review* was not a newspaper; it was a journal of opinion—a commentary, which taught the masses in Queen Anne's reign what to think upon important political and social questions.

Defoe was well prepared for his role. His parents were Puritans, who saw that their son, originally intended for the ministry, was well instructed in Scripture. The King James Bible is the most obvious influence upon Defoe's style. Once during rumor of a Catholic plot, he helped make manuscript copies of it to preserve when printed copies were no more. Excluded from the universities, like all dissenters, Defoe was educated in the dissenting academy of the Rev. Charles Morton at Newington Green. That was all to the good, for the academies were far ahead of the universities in the study of geography, history, mathematics, and the modern languages, including English itself. If Defoe's education was not deep, it was broad and served him in journalism better than one more specialized. Its best service, perhaps, was that it gave him a grasp of facts so that his mind could study their relation. A very penetrating remark of Professor James Sutherland, Defoe's latest biographer, is that "for all his obvious bias towards the practical, he does live in a world of ideas."[1] And he helped very ordinary readers into that world. In a real sense he was bringing philosophy out of the study.

It is not strange that Defoe's practical temperament and Morton's

[1] *Defoe* (London, 1937), p. 125.

practical curriculum turned Defoe aside from preaching. "It was," he says in the *Review*, his disaster "first to be set a-part for, and then to be set a-part from the Honour of that Sacred Employ."[2] Instead he went into business, which furthered his knowledge of men and then thrust him out to live by his pen. Whether dipped in ink for the sins of his parents, or for his own, dipped he was. He began writing, he tells us, in the reign of Charles II before his marriage and his induction into business, and during the reign of William III he wrote increasingly. But it was a well-known event early in Anne's reign which determined the rest of his course—the publication of *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, late in 1702. A very important consequence of Defoe's trial and imprisonment was the hastening of an understanding between Defoe and Harley and the founding of the *Review*. No biographer of Defoe has yet observed that Defoe and Harley had been approaching some kind of an understanding before *The Shortest Way* appeared. Harley not only had in 1702 sounded out Godolphin about enlisting a journalist in their cause,[3] but, through William Paterson, had been in communication with Defoe and perhaps had encouraged him. Defoe's letter to Paterson, written in April, 1703, while Defoe was in hiding, can mean nothing else. "If," says Defoe of Harley, "I have rendered the hopes you gave me of his favour desperate by this disaster, 'tis a misfortune as great as all the rest."[4]

From the tone of the letter it is probable that Harley was not a party to the publication of *The Shortest Way*. And Defoe was too alarmed at the prospect of jail and pillory to recognize that Harley must have been pleased by the tempest which Defoe had raised and which swept Harley into office as one of the Secretaries of State. The belief that Defoe began the *Review* while still in prison, though persisting in Mr. G. D. H. Cole's expensive edition of the *Tour* (1927) and in the Blackwell edition of Defoe's works (1927), has been untenable since the publication in 1897 of the Defoe-Harley correspondence in the Portland Papers.[5]

[2] Vol. VI, No. 86.

[3] E. S. Roscoe, *Robert Harley* (London, 1902), p. 72; quoted in D. H. Stevens, *Party Politics and English Journalism* (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1916), p. 47.

[4] Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Manuscripts of the Duke of Portland*, IV (London, 1897), 61–62.

[5] W. P. Trent in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. IX (Cambridge, 1913), Chap. 1; Paul Dottin, *De Foe et ses romans* (3 vols., Paris, 1924), I, 124;

Defoe was free early in November, but his pantile business, already undermined by litigation and debts, which Defoe had been unduly reticent in paying, was ruined, and of necessity he turned to journalism. The story of Defoe's years in the service of Harley and the government has been adequately told by M. Paul Dottin and more recently by Professor Sutherland in his *Defoe*. The *Review* was an important part of that service.

THE "REVIEW" AND ITS FEATURES

The *Review* is a periodical which Defoe wrote and published in nine volumes from February 19, 1704, to June 11, 1713. It covers nearly the whole of Queen Anne's reign—an important period in which Marlborough won his famous victories and England and Scotland were united. It was the period, moreover, of the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*, Swift's *Journal to Stella*, and Pope's *Essay on Criticism* and *The Rape of the Lock*. Though the reign of Anne was turbulent, it was, as Professor G. M. Trevelyan says, the prelude to a long era of content and prosperity, "and Defoe . . . was the typical man of his day."[6]

The *Review* began as an eight-page weekly, on Saturdays. But Defoe discovered that its unusual size led sellers to double the price of a penny. So with No. 5, he began the use of smaller type and reduced the number of pages to four. With No. 7, he introduced a Tuesday issue, and with Volume II, No. 8, a Thursday issue; thereafter, except for the early part of Volume [IX], the *Review* was a triweekly.

The original caption, continued with modification through Volume II, may not be altogether clear. When Defoe called his paper "A Weekly Review of the Affairs of France," England and her allies were at war with France, fighting to keep Louis XIV from placing his grandson on the Spanish throne. To Defoe's contemporaries the affairs of France were the affairs of England.

While the *Review* was getting started, Defoe used captions as advertisements; but when it was established and space was increasingly at a premium, he simplified and standardized them. He dropped "Weekly" with No. 8; the paper had become a biweekly with No. 7. In Volume II,

---

Sutherland, *Defoe*, p. 104; A. W. Secord, "Defoe's Release from Newgate," in London *Times Literary Supplement*, Jan. 26, 1928, p. 62.

[6] *Blenheim* (London, 1930), p. 2.

the caption was further shortened and clarified to "A REVIEW OF THE Affairs of *FRANCE*: With some Observations on TRANSACTIONS at Home." With Volume III, it became "A REVIEW OF THE STATE OF THE ENGLISH NATION," and, in Volume IV, No. 12, in recognition of the Union, "A REVIEW OF THE STATE OF THE BRITISH NATION"—the form used continuously thereafter until abbreviated to the one word "REVIEW" in Volume [IX].

Throughout its nine volumes the *Review* consisted of an essay usually followed by a briefer part made up of answers to correspondents and social criticism. This diversion Defoe thought necessary to attract readers, but he pretended to give it unwillingly. Its first title, "*Mercure Scandale:* OR, ADVICE from the Scandalous Club. Translated out of *French*," was, like the *Review* captions, progressively abbreviated to "ADVICE from the Scandal. CLUB," by which it is best known.

Presently the diverting matter overflowed into five monthly supplements of twenty-eight pages each, dated September, 1704–January, 1705. But the supplements lagged, the last one not appearing till in May, 1705, long after the end of Volume I. A month later Defoe inaugurated another series of supplements identical in format with the *Review* and appearing on Wednesdays and Fridays, between numbers of the *Review*. The new supplement, called *The Little Review*, exists in only two known copies, BM-c[7] and S, each of which has twenty-three numbers, and, though it was discontinued apparently without notice, twenty-three numbers were probably the whole of it.

With Volume III the caption of the secondary part was changed to MISCELLANEA, a title which is the only feature to survive the periodical tax of 1712 and reappear in Volume [IX]. The Miscellanea is graver than the Advice; usually it was only an occasion for changing the subject and introducing a second essay. Though Defoe occasionally threatened to revive his old Club, he remarked with satisfaction that the *Tatler* had taken up its work of reforming morals.

With Volume VI, Defoe began an Edinburgh edition of the *Review*, in the main a reprint of the London edition, and continued it through thirty-five numbers of Volume VII. The Edinburgh edition, we are told, was distributed in Scotland, in the northern counties of England,

[7] For list of symbols, see p. xiii.

and in Ireland. When it was discontinued, Defoe supplied his northern readers with specially printed London copies—to be described later.

Volume VIII ran to sixteen months and 211 numbers. Defoe continued it to the end of July, 1712, in order to start Volume [IX] simultaneously with the tax on periodicals. He met the tax by reducing the *Review* to a single leaf (two pages), printed in smaller type. The title was simply "REVIEW." Defoe regarded the volume as the beginning of a new series, and he called it Volume I. Though it began as a biweekly (Tuesday and Saturday), it became a triweekly again with No. 43. But Defoe's illness and imprisonment interfered with its regular appearance.

Only those who have read the *Review*, said William Lee, who had read it as few students have, "can be thoroughly acquainted with Defoe." Lee may have let his enthusiasm carry him too far in asserting that it contains "many passages, both of prose and verse, which, for fineness of wit, delicacy of expression, force of morality, and historical value, are not to be surpassed in the whole range of English literature." But critics agree with him that in magnitude and variety of matter it is Defoe's greatest single achievement.[8] In spite of his frequent and long absences from London, he kept the printer supplied with twelve pages of copy a week for approximately nine years. In the Preface of Volume IV he mentioned a warm gentleman in a coffee house who exclaimed that "*he has been in* Scotland *this Twelve-Month, and he pretends to write a Paper in* London." Defoe admitted that it was not easy to do nearly 400 miles away. One inconvenience of his absence was that his comments were sometimes irrelevant or worse by the time they appeared in print. His prediction in the issue of May 18, 1706, that victories were over for that campaign reached London simultaneously with news of the victory of Ramillies. Defoe protested that two weeks were required for his comments to appear after a piece of news was received in London. But a few months earlier he had promised London readers replies to their letters in a week's time. The post made the journey from London to Edinburgh in less than three days.[9]

Though, as Dottin thinks, Defoe may sometimes have drawn upon old matter, he appears to have written the whole *Review*, including the

[8] William Lee, *Daniel Defoe: His Life and Recently Discovered Writings* (3 vols., London, 1869), I, 85.

[9] Sutherland, *Defoe*, p. 116; *Review*, Vol. IV, Nos. 2, 92.

supplements, unaided except by correspondents. So far as has been ascertained, only the Appendix to Volume I, containing the French laws against dueling, and a single number of the *Review* were not from Defoe's pen.[10] He had a skill which enabled him to write rapidly what he wished to say. The manuscript, now in the British Museum, of the number for December 31, 1709, shows but two erasures.[11]

Reading in the *Review* increases respect for it. It shows Defoe as a shrewd observer of the social scene and anticipates some of the matter of the novels, especially of *Moll Flanders*, with frequent consideration of ethical matters like love out of marriage, girls abandoned by betrayers, obligation to women of no character, and descriptions of fires and other street scenes. Defoe expressed dislike for writing answers to correspondents and the Advice from the Scandal. Club. Perhaps with his frequent journeys and political activity, he found it more convenient to stick to the principal essay which could be written at any time and place. He ceased to allow space for queries after *The Little Review*, but till near the end he continued to reply to them in the advertisements. Once while he was in Scotland, he announced that he would within a week's time and in his best manner answer entertaining queries.[12]

Though Professor E. G. Fletcher minimizes the influence of the *Review* upon the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*, Defoe himself was quick to remark that the *Tatler* was a continuation of his efforts at social instruction in the Scandal. Club essays. And extensive reading in the *Review* supports his assumption. Trevelyan censures the *Review* as less moral than the *Tatler*. Though he cites only Steele's attack on dueling, which may be matched by Defoe's, he had in mind, probably, passages like those in *The Little Review* which treat erotic matters with gayety. Perhaps these were the passages which caused the House of Commons to protest to the Bishops of the *Review's* licentiousness.[13] But one suspects that the protest was as much political as moral. No one had attacked debauchery

[10] Vol. IV, No. 127, has a notice that, copy having been delayed by the "Badness of the Roads," the reader was offered instead some verses "as they were sometime since transmitted to us in the following Letter." The verses, it is said, were by an amateur poet, J. A.

[11] Dottin, *De Foe et ses romans*, I, 128.

[12] Vol. IV, No. 2.

[13] See the *Review*, Vol. I, Appendix (in Facsimile Book 3). Also G. M. Trevelyan, *Ramillies* (London, 1932), pp. 24, 89.

more vigorously than Defoe. Though that may have been in part a journalistic device, the *Review* and its supplements must have been an important civilizing force among simple readers. It is true they treat delicate matters in a merry tone, but their advice is sensible and probably more effective than if it had been presented gravely.

The *Review*, if we assume that Harley and Godolphin were subsidizing it, could not have avoided being mainly a political organ. Defoe pretended to be more interested in trade and several times proposed writing exclusively on it. Some of his best papers deal with economics. The firsthand account of the corn crop, based on his leisurely trip to Scotland described in Volume VI, No. 82, is like the best parts of the *Tour*. He was discussing the difference between cheapness and dearness of corn and cleared up a point of economics in a way which the man in the street could understand.[14] He discussed vigorously the desirability of a free press and of curbing piratical printers. The Preface to Volume VII has shrewd comments on the proposed periodical tax.

There were, however, the affairs of France with which he began. When he got around to trade, the election of 1705 drew him aside. Then the negotiations for the union with Scotland filled up Volumes IV and V. In Volume VI, which English readers shared with Scottish, he strove hard to overcome prejudices of the one against the other. He explained to England that Episcopal dissenters were not mistreated in Scotland and to Scotland that High Fliers and Jacobites were a menace in England. Against his better judgment, he presented in the press the case of the government against Sacheverell and suffered a great loss in prestige for doing so. Shortly after the conclusion of the trial, a High Church mob, as he says, kidnapped his printer, Matthews, and so intimidated him that Defoe turned to John Baker who could not be tampered with. Earlier than that, copies to be reprinted in Edinburgh had been intercepted in the post, and the newsdealers in London had been by force or fraud so interfered with in selling the *Review* that Defoe had to announce special depots where copies could be certainly had.[15]

[14] Professor J. R. Moore has recently published a good study, based in part upon the *Review*, of Defoe's economic theories. See Indiana University *Studies*, No. 104 (Bloomington, 1935).

[15] Vol. VI, Edinburgh No. 147; London No. 149; Vol. VII, No. 13. See also Sutherland, *Defoe*, pp. 120–121, and C. N. Greenough, "Defoe in Boston," in *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXVIII (Boston, 1935), 472 ff.

Though Defoe made his peace with Harley, who returned to power after the Sacheverell upheaval had cost Godolphin his office, the *Review* never regained its hold on the masses. Its support of the treaty of Utrecht led to further distrust. Many of his prefaces speak of bitter and violent treatment from rivals and other enemies, but the Preface of Volume VIII shows genuine weariness with the "paper war." It shows more than weariness. In it Defoe surveyed the "almost Ten Years" of the *Review* and defends himself against the charge of being a hireling. Additional afflictions mentioned are his insupportable debts, his harsh creditors, and the expense of a large family. Obviously he was losing enthusiasm for his paper, though as he had said two days earlier (No. 211) he "must not lay it down" and let railers triumph.

Professor Sutherland, who has some interesting data on the distribution of Queen Anne periodicals, doubts that the *Review* ever reached a circulation of 1,000. An estimate soon after its inauguration in 1704 placed the sale of each issue at 400. But, as Professor Sutherland points out, most Londoners then did not buy journals; they read them in their coffee houses. And the illiterate masses gathered even in the streets about one who could read, to "listen to an *Observator* or *Review*." It is obvious that the *Review* had an influence all out of proportion to its sales.[16]

But in 1713 the *Review* had run its course, and its author felt the need of a new start if he was to regain his hold on the public. It is not known how much that public was mystified by his clever, if not very convincing, ruse. In the *Review* of June 6, he announced that he was bringing to a close "this long Work" and that, having offended "the Legal Authority," he was retiring "many Hundred Miles" to become "a quiet Spectator" of affairs.

He had, he says, contemplated writing on trade with France when "on a suddain I found my Province Invaded . . . by an unexpected Paper without an Author, and call'd the *Mercator*," which, if not under government direction, was encouraged by it and given original documents, "Things . . . which I never pretended to." The issue of Thursday,

[16] Sutherland, *Defoe*, pp. 110 ff.; C. E. Burch, "Notes on the Contemporary Popularity of Defoe's *Review*," in *Philological Quarterly*, XVI (1937), 210–213. See the Preface to Vol. VII of the *Review* for Defoe's estimate of the total circulation of periodicals a year or so before the tax was imposed on August 1, 1712.

June 11, concluded with "*Exit REVIEW.*" To the "unexpected Paper without an Author," Defoe had probably been contributing from its origin two weeks earlier—if he was not yet its principal author.

THE STORY OF THIS EDITION

At the Cleveland meeting of the Modern Language Association in 1929, Professor Frank A. Patterson first asked me to serve on a committee to direct the Facsimile Text Society's project of reissuing the *Review*. I agreed readily to find and attempt to borrow the proper texts for the reproduction. Though none of us knew very well what we were trying to do, we assumed that the project could be carried out with little trouble. After considerable search, we found that all the known sets are seriously defective and that important differences exist in them. What had appeared a simple and relatively inexpensive procedure turned out to be, in the hard times of the early thirties, almost impossible.

In 1933 Professor Patterson revived the project. A "pushing committee," composed of Professors Margery Bailey, Richmond P. Bond, J. W. Draper, Walter Graham, the late C. N. Greenough, R. F. Jones, J. R. Moore, and A. W. Secord, with Professor Patterson as chairman, was put in charge. The program of English Group VII at the St. Louis meeting of the M.L.A. in December, 1933, was devoted to the project. The plan evolved was to secure advance subscriptions and a sum of money from a foundation. A prospectus was issued, with opinions on the *Review* by men like Trevelyan, Gay, Trent, and Seligman. Subscribers were promised sets at a reduced price; they were, also, to have their names in the initial volume, to indicate their collaboration in a great scholarly enterprise. The committee set to work energetically and has, finally, the long list of subscribers whose names are recorded in Facsimile Book 1. It did not, of course, all happen at once; without the patience and persistence of Professor Patterson, it could not have happened at all. The large university and college libraries subscribed readily. But the encouraging feature has been the support of many smaller colleges and of individual scholars and friends.

Meanwhile, librarians and friends in America and England had been accumulating data for me to digest. In January of this year, the Society succeeded in borrowing all four of the important American sets of the *Review* and bringing them together, for collation and photographing,

in the Columbia University Library. The owners of those sets, Mr. Arch W. Shaw, of Chicago and Winnetka, the Boston Public Library, the University of Texas Library, and the Yale University Library, have been generous indeed; all the sets were available for four or five months, and some until the plates were completed and the notes checked.

The sets had been in New York only a few days when I arrived for a three weeks' study of them, with the able and accurate assistance of Mr. French R. Fogle, graduate student at Columbia University and assistant on the Index to the Columbia edition of *The Works of John Milton*. Mr. Fogle undertook the page by page comparison of the several copies and so left me free to study minutely the relation of the London and Edinburgh editions of Volumes VI and VII. For the rest, I ranged through the volumes, examining titles and special notices, prefaces, opening and closing numbers, supplements, and, especially, what I have called, for lack of a better name, the "imperfects" of Volumes VII–VIII. Since Defoe's day, probably so many sets have not been together or another Defoe investigator had such an opportunity as I to compare them.

Several months earlier Professor Greenough, finding himself in ill-health and unable to complete gathering the information needed for the Bibliographical Note, withdrew from the enterprise. Thereupon the whole editorial burden fell to me. A few days before I had finished my work with the sets at Columbia, Professor Greenough turned over to me the data he had collected, principally volume by volume tables showing the number, date, and pagination of each issue as he had found it in the Shaw copy. To these tables I have turned constantly in checking my own data. Professor Greenough had, also, valuable notations upon A, BA, and Hu, which I have not seen. For his generosity I have, perhaps, shown too little gratitude in occasionally refuting speculations in his notes which may not have reflected his latest opinions. But wherever I have been obligated to him for light, I have made acknowledgment.

AIMS AND METHODS

From our list of sets, it may seem that no need exists for a new edition. But the list is misleading, as one who wants to use the *Review* presently discovers. *The Little Review* exists in but two copies; Volume

[IX] exists in but two, both incomplete. Volume VIII exists in three copies, but one of them is made up of "imperfects." No adequate copy of the Edinburgh edition of Volumes VI–VII exists in Great Britain or on the Continent. The three most nearly complete sets, BM-c, S, and Tr-d (with Tr-l and Tr-m), lack important parts. Only three other known sets remotely approach completeness: BM-b, Te, and Y, each of which lacks two or more volumes.

Though William Lee planned an anthology of the *Review* nearly seventy years ago, no considerable portion of it has ever been reprinted. The eight prefaces and the three numbers in Aitken's *Later Stuart Tracts* (in *An English Garner*), hitherto the fullest reprinting available, serve but to emphasize the need of an edition like this one. The whole *Review* is, of course, too vast and too uneven for the general reader. The ephemeral and the uninspired must and will in time be sifted. But, with the growing interest in Defoe and the *Review*, we first need the whole, and then we can better make selections. The fact that subscribers have been willing to subsidize this edition is sufficient evidence of the immediate demand. When there is sufficient demand for the anthology, it too will come.

The *Review* is here reprinted as complete as possible, with title pages, prefaces, indices, and supplements, amounting to 5,610 pages. That includes fifty-four pages (title leaf and thirteen numbers) of the Edinburgh edition which are without equivalent in the regular London edition. It does not include the long account, given in Facsimile Book 14, of the variant readings in the other Edinburgh numbers. Unless there are supplements still undiscovered, we have all of the *Review* except a single leaf, No. 81, Volume [IX], no copy of which seems now to exist.

Our aim has been a modest one. The discovery of every variation in the copies would be a work of years. We did not try to do that; human life is still of limited duration, and human eyesight still has some value. We did try, however, to make sure we know what constitutes a complete set of the *Review*; to be sure that the copies used in this edition are authentic and complete; and to discover the more obvious and significant variations.

As a matter of fact, except in numbering, dating, and pagination, Mr. Fogle and I have found very few variations in copies of the regular

London edition. We did discover in Y-1 (Vol. VII, No. 5, pp. 19–20) that a leaf had been lost or removed and a new one inserted, with the recto printed in type imitative of that used in the original and the verso blank.[17] In Volume I, No. 4, some copies have one advertisement; others have two. And in Edinburgh Volume VI, No. 144, Te is misdated and lacks advertisements which appear in the other correctly dated copies. Further than that there is an occasional misprint corrected in some copies only. These, like the variations in dating, pagination, etc., have been treated in the notes. The important differences between the London and the Edinburgh editions of Volumes VI–VII and between what I have called the "perfects" and the "imperfects" of Volumes VII–VIII are discussed at length below and in the notes.

Some may regret that our edition is a mosaic of all the important sets, including, for *The Little Review* and for Volume [IX], the Crossley set in the British Museum. But though it would doubtless have been desirable to reprint the whole, or at least whole volumes, from a particular set, say the Trent or the Shaw, it was not practicable to do so. All have gaps and dim or trimmed pages, unsuitable for photographing, and some of them are badly foxed. Some are, as has just been said, occasionally fuller and more correct than others. The result is that we have been forced to select here and there from the various sets. We have kept steadily in mind the needs of those who are likely to use our edition and have, near the end of the respective bibliographical notes, appended check lists indicating the original of each page of the text.

Where misprints occur in some copies only, we have tried to use those in which they do not occur. In the December supplement to Volume I, Tr-d and Te-1 have confusing errors in pagination which do not appear in S. We have, therefore, reprinted S, even though it has one slight defect in the type. On the other hand, S No. 117 in Volume VIII is badly mispaged; however, we have used it in preference to Tr-m, which is correctly paged but dim.

The necessity of legibility has compelled us to another step which we took reluctantly. That was to make use of a few of those numbers of Volumes VII–VIII without dates, advertisements, and colophon, which I have called "imperfects" and which are explained in detail below. As

[17] See note in Facsimile Book 17, p. ix.

they were, except for modifications usually limited to outer form pages, from identically the same type as the "perfects," it seemed legitimate to use the inner form (inside) pages from them when we could not get sufficiently legible plates from the "perfects." Never have we reprinted an outer form page of the "imperfects," and never an inner form page without first checking it line for line with the corresponding page in the "perfects." Finally, we have taken unusual care to indicate in the check lists which pages were reprinted from the "imperfects." Otherwise, only a microscope would discover them.

For a few dim pages we have been unable to get more legible copies even in the British Museum. We have transcribed in the notes all illegible passages. The following information about the physical features of this edition is from Miss Eugenia Porter, of the Columbia University Press.

Legibility was the criterion where it was impossible to find a copy free from imperfections of one sort or another. If a page contains dark spots, faint passages, missing letters, words, or folios; if it has smudged type or if it curves at the binding edge, indicating that the bound copy could not be opened flat for photographing, one may assume that, even so, it was the best available from the point of view of legibility and that it represents the printed original. Marginal notations in pen or pencil have been preserved if they were dark enough to be photographed.

The unevenness of color in the reproduction will approximate that of the original, though it will not always be as pronounced. The originals showed a wide variation between light and dark, not only among the separate pages but on a single page. This difference will be accentuated on certain pages where, to pick up faint spots, the photographic process further blackens parts already dark.

It has been impossible to reproduce the margins of the originals because of the variety in width and length of the type pages. Some pages had been imposed so high as to lose the folio in the trim for binding, and some so low as to lose the imprint. Many had been imposed crooked. Margins for the reproduction were chosen to show the average type page satisfactorily imposed on a trimmed page large enough to accommodate the type page of the largest original volume, Volume [IX].

It should be added that type pages of this reprint are exactly the same in size as those of the original. A single exception is the first number (pp. 1–2) of Volume [IX]. The type of page 1 has been reduced from

$8\frac{9}{16} \times 6\frac{3}{16}$ inches to $7\frac{7}{8} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ inches; and that of page 2, from $8\frac{1}{8} \times 6\frac{3}{16}$ inches to $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ inches.

In the Bibliographical Note prefixed to each of Defoe's nine volumes,[18] the usual bibliographical data are digested at the beginning, and particular features like changes of title or colophon, errors in folios, and information about the *Review* itself are discussed in notes on the appropriate issues. I have not usually pointed out minor defects, like trimmed colophon and folio, unless they occur in the copy chosen for reproduction. Errors in date and in page number, typographical peculiarities, and noticeable misprints I have listed. In the notes, statements without more specific limitations apply only to those copies mentioned as having been collated.

The pagination of the *Review*, often and for long stretches sadly incorrect, we have decided to let stand as it was. To correct it would mean either unwarranted tampering with the text or, for much of the *Review*, dual pagination, which might only confound confusion. Issues are numbered and dated, and accurate references can be made in spite of erroneous pagination. Causes of errors will be suggested below in the section on printing the *Review*.

THE ORDER OF PARTS
VOLUMES I–II

In Volume I, we have placed the five monthly supplements after the regular numbers and before the Appendix and the Contents, which, having been printed as a unit with a single series of signatures, cannot be separated. Tr-d interpolates the supplements after the numbers for the corresponding months. But there is no textual relation between the *Review* and the supplements, and they did not appear in the months for which they are named. There is, then, no logical reason to interpolate them; and the convenience of readers makes it still less desirable to do so. Other copies place the supplements after the Contents. That is more convenient than the arrangement in Tr-d but less logical, for the supplements are indexed in the Contents. Though numbers of *The Little Review* may have appeared as dated, we have, in harmony with our procedure in Volume I, placed them after the regular numbers of Volume II.

[18] Facsimile Books 1, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, and 22.

PAMPHLETS BOUND WITH THE "REVIEW" VOLUMES II AND IV

None of the pamphlets sometimes bound with the *Review* are integral parts of it, and all have been omitted from this edition.[19] That in BM-b, Volume II, "The Moderation, Justice and Manners of the *Review* Exemplified from His Own Works," is an attack upon the *Review*, which took a moderate position between extremes like Tutchin's Whig *Observator* and Leslie's Tory *Rehearsal*. To what Defoe called the Hot-Party, moderation was more exasperating than hostility. But, as Professor Sutherland remarks, "news-writers of the early eighteenth century lived by pointing out stains in each other's washing."[20]

With Te Volume II are bound three pamphlets: "The Lord Haversham's Speech," "The Lord Haversham's Vindication of His Speech," and "A Reply to . . . L[ord] H[aversham]'s Vindication of His Speech." The first two are, of course, Lord Haversham's. The last, copies of which are bound with O and Tr-d also, is Defoe's, and parts of it had appeared in the *Review*, Volume II, No. 113.[21] But like "A Hymn to Peace," which is bound with it in Tr-d, it was issued as a wholly separate work. Parts of "A Hymn" appeared with additions in the *Review*, Volume III, Nos. 116-118.

In BM-c Volume IV, "Dyer's News Examined as to His Sweddish [*sic*] Memorial against the Review" is a separate publication in which Defoe replied to those who had aroused the credulous Swedish ambassador to protest against inoffensive allusions to Charles XII in the *Review*.[22] The two pamphlets bound with S Volume IV have not, so far as I can find, been noticed in print. Both have four pages and are otherwise like the *Review* in format. Neither has title page or indication of author or printer. At the bottom of the last page of each, they are said to have been "Printed in the Year" 1706 and 1707, respectively. The caption of the first reads: "THE / CHARACTER OF A / *TRUE ENGLISH-MAN*, / Not to be found in the Number FIVE, *Viz.* / 1. *A Honorary Levite*; 2. *A Tacker*; 3. *A* / *Non-juror*; 4. *A Popelin*; 5. *A*

[19] The Appendix to Vol. I is not an integral part of the *Review* except that Defoe printed it and the Contents together, to be bound with the *Review*.

[20] *Defoe*, p. 112.

[21] Sutherland, *Defoe*, pp. 117–119.

[22] Dottin, *De Foe et ses romans*, I, 173.

Zam-zum- / mim of High-Church./" The caption of the second reads: "THE / Game at Picquet; / OR, A / MEMORIAL / TO THE / *GREAT BRITAINS./*" Though Defoe may have written them, they have a terseness unlike what Abel Boyer called his "loose spinning way of writing." Professor T. F. M. Newton, who thinks they are probably not Defoe's, tells me that Professor Greenough had classified the former as anonymous in his collection of "characters."

THE EDINBURGH EDITION
VOLUMES VI–VII

Volume VI presents many problems growing out of the fact that it exists in two editions, the London and the Edinburgh. Defoe had been in Edinburgh frequently and for long periods from the beginning of negotiations for the union of Scotland and England; and he took an active part in Edinburgh journalism. Besides issuing a number of pamphlets, he seems to have contributed to Boig's *Edinburgh Courant* in 1708 and 1709. On February 1, 1709/10, he was given permission by the Edinburgh Town Council to publish it in place of Boig, who had died five days earlier.[23] But as he returned to London at that time he took only slight advantage of this permission. On December 13, 1710, he contracted with David Fearn, advocate, to publish the *Postman*.[24]

Little has been known of the Edinburgh edition of the *Review* and its relation to the London edition, largely because no adequate copy of the Edinburgh edition has been available in Great Britain since the Aitken Library went to the University of Texas. That there was an Edinburgh edition all students of the *Review* have been aware. The Preface to Volume V announces it, and No. 27 of London Volume VI says, inaccurately, as the first number is dated March 31, that the *Review* had been published in Edinburgh since March 25, 1709, and distributed from there to Scotland, the northern counties of England, and Ireland.

All this is well known. But no biographer of Defoe has exhibited any firsthand acquaintance with the contents of the Edinburgh numbers.

[23] C. E. Burch, "Defoe's Connections with the *Edinburgh Courant*," in *Review of English Studies*, V (1929), 437 ff. See also W. J. Couper, *The Edinburgh Periodical Press* (2 vols., Stirling, Scotland, 1908), I, 244–246.

[24] *Notes and Queries*, 3d ser., IX (1866), 77. The *Postman* may be the *Scots Postman* mentioned below, p. xxxvi. See Couper, *The Edinburgh Periodical Press*, I, 232.

That lack of knowledge is well illustrated by Mr. W. J. Couper, who, from the inaccurate notice that the Edinburgh Volume VI began on March 25 and the fact that the London Volume VI began on April 5, suspected that the London numbers may be the reprints and the Edinburgh the originals.[25]

It is strange that no copies of the Edinburgh edition have previously been reported in Edinburgh. Professor C. E. Burch tells me there is none in the University Library, the Library of the Signet, or the Advocates' Library; and Mr. Couper laments the absence of them. Very recently Mr. H. Bergholz reports Nos. 1–17 of Edinburgh Volume VI in the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh,[26] though there has not been time to investigate them. In the United States, however, there are four copies of Edinburgh Volume VI and two of the Edinburgh portion of Volume VII, and in Canada there is another of the latter. But they are scattered from Texas to Montreal, and opportunities to compare them with their London counterparts have been few. It was not till 1933[27] that Professor Greenough announced definitely the existence of at least thirty-five Edinburgh issues of Volume VII. Only two other authentic accounts of the Edinburgh edition have heretofore been available, both by Professor E. G. Fletcher, who has given a brief—but on the whole a reliable—comparison of the two printings.[28]

It may be useful to dissipate any lingering doubt that the Edinburgh edition was really printed in Edinburgh. As late as 1933 Professor Greenough, though his manuscript notes reveal that he knew better for Volume VI, thought that probably the Edinburgh numbers of Volume VII were printed in London. But there is not the slightest doubt that the whole Edinburgh Volume VI, including title page and Preface, and the thirty-five Edinburgh numbers of Volume VII were printed in Edinburgh by "the Heirs and Successors," that is, the widow, of Andrew Anderson. In the first place the Edinburgh edition is from a wholly

[25] *The Edinburgh Periodical Press*, I, 235–236.

[26] London *Times Literary Supplement*, June 18, 1938, p. 424.

[27] *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXVIII, p. 461. Greenough's paper, "Defoe in Boston," though presented to the Society in 1933, was not published till 1935.

[28] "Some Notes on Defoe's *Review*" in *Notes and Queries*, CLXVI (1934), 218 ff; "The London and Edinburgh Printings of Defoe's *Review*, Volume VI," in University of Texas *Studies in English* No. 14 (Austin, 1934), pp. 50 ff.

different setting of type, usually much larger than that in the London. The Edinburgh issues have numbering, dating, and pagination consistently differing from those of the London. Both title page and Preface of Edinburgh Volume VI have an Edinburgh imprint. Had Defoe sent printed copies for distribution in Edinburgh, he would have, as he was to do later, printed them from the type used in the London edition. If type was to be set twice, it could be done cheaper in Edinburgh.

Defoe, moreover, announced in the Preface of Volume V, in Volume VI, L No. 27, and elsewhere that the *Review* was being reprinted in Edinburgh. The Edinburgh issues began with the Anderson-Edinburgh imprint in the colophon, and, though it was withdrawn after No. 7, Defoe speaks in E No. 147 of recent threats to keep Mrs. Anderson from printing the *Review*. A year or so later a rival printer, James Watson, Jr., charged her with sedition for reprinting the *Review* a whole year.[29]

What Defoe did, as I have pointed out in the Bibliographical Note, was to send off copy for four introductory numbers to get the Edinburgh edition started while he finished the preceding volume in London. Then with E No. 5 (= L No. 1) he began reprinting the London numbers in Edinburgh. At first he allowed four and five days (since the week has an odd number of days) for the printed copies of the London issues to arrive in Edinburgh and be reprinted. But he found that time too little and, with E No. 8, increased it to eleven and twelve days. Why four days were not enough is not clear.

For three-quarters of a century the post had been providing two-way service between London and Edinburgh in six days. The *Review* itself advertised, while Defoe was in Scotland, that correspondents might have replies to their queries in Defoe's best style in a week, which included the time for printing. In apologizing for untimely statements, Defoe remarked once that news reached him a week late in Scotland; at another time earlier, he had said two weeks. But bad roads and other hindrances delayed the post, and Defoe seems to have held copies till he had three to send in a packet. After L No. 129 (= E No. 132), the time was reduced to four and five days again, and, in Volume VII, after L No. 7 (= E No. 6), to two and three days, with no apparent

[29] Couper, *The Edinburgh Periodical Press*, I, 237.

inconvenience.[30] It is obvious that the Edinburgh printer was more particular to give subscribers their full quota of numbers than to publish them on time.

When Defoe reached Edinburgh for a five months' stay in September, 1709, he upset the even tenor of the Edinburgh edition. Not till his return to London was a new sequence established which lasted to the end of the volume and beyond. From September through December, though Defoe was in Edinburgh, most of the numbers continued to be printed first in London. In the last month of his stay, January, 1710, almost all were printed first in Edinburgh, and some of them enough earlier to have been reprinted in London from Edinburgh copies.

But throughout the five months, most of the issues in both editions were printed from manuscript copy. That meant that variants might arise from three sources, from the copyist who made the second manuscript and from both the London and the Edinburgh compositors. When one edition was reprinted from the other, there was only one source of variations, the second compositor.

The variations when two manuscripts were used are not, in the *Review*, very significant, but they are numerous. The essay in L No. 71 (= E No. 69), the first to appear in Edinburgh prior to its publication in London, was the first to be printed from dual manuscripts. It is, also, the first to show in its two editions numerous petty differences. The editions of the essay in L No. 72 (= E No. 73) have many minor differences owing to dual manuscripts. L No. 73 (= E No. 70) is the first which might have been composed from printed Edinburgh copy; its being in large type like the Edinburgh edition and having fewer variants suggest that it was.

Some essays which could have been reprinted in Edinburgh from London copy probably were not. Defoe, being in Edinburgh, no doubt furnished the printer with manuscript copy, though it was not used promptly. Many small variations indicate that he had. One series of essays appears in the two editions with identical numbering, dating, and pagination. Fletcher points out that if the dates are bona fide, these are probably the first instances of simultaneous periodical publication in London and Edinburgh. There is evidence that Defoe while in Scotland

[30] See Vol. IV, Nos. 2 and 92, and Vol. VII, No. 128.

planned many more such identical pairs. That the sequence was often interrupted by the caprice of printers or of the post is obvious from the glimpses here and there of designs gone awry.

Some of the essays appeared in only one of the two editions of Volume VI, leaving 143 common to both. The notes indicate the relation of the two editions. A full table of the numbers with their dates may be found in Professor Fletcher's article.[81] That table is accurate except for failure to report L Nos. 94 and 99 the equivalents respectively of E Nos. 96 and 99 and for a few minor oversights corrected in the notes in Facsimile Book 14.

On the whole, not many important differences appear in the essays common to the two editions. E No. 75 has a Miscellanea and E No. 147 a long advertisement not in their London equivalents. Most of a paragraph in the London edition is omitted in E No. 10. A long announcement of restrictions on plays in E No. 74 (= L No. 65) was added after L No. 65 appeared on September 1. The announcement mentions an embarrassment to the actors on September 7. Other lesser variations are cited in the Bibliographical Note. The only major alteration discovered in the text of the main essays is in L No. 117 and E No. 111, wherein the Edinburgh number has a long tirade against the Lord Mayor for (as Defoe supposed) commanding Sacheverell to print his famous sermon, "Perils of False Brethren." In the two weeks before the essay appeared in London, Defoe learned more of the circumstance and directed his attack at Sacheverell for pretending he had printed at the Lord Mayor's command.

Defoe expressed the hope of better treatment in Edinburgh than the *Review* had received in London. But even there its enemies interfered with its regular appearance. The long "Advertisement" prefixed to E No. 147, which appeared a week or two late, tells of threats against the printer and thefts of copies in the post. Whether feeling aroused by the Sacheverell trial in London or rival hostility to Mrs. Anderson was the greater cause of this is not clear. In that "Advertisement" Defoe intimated that he had considered discontinuing the Edinburgh printing at the end of Volume VI. But he kept on for thirty-five numbers in Volume VII.

[81] Texas *Studies in English*, No. 14, pp. 50–58.

THE RIDDLE OF THE "IMPERFECTS" VOLUMES VII–VIII

The problems of Volume VII are two: (1) that again of the London and the Edinburgh editions and (2) that of the "imperfects," numbers usually without dates, true advertisements (not mere notices), and regular colophon. Professors Greenough and Fletcher have called attention to the former. They knew that at least thirty-five numbers appeared in the Edinburgh edition of Volume VII; they found these in two copies, A and Te. And now Professor Newton comes with news of a third one, M. In all three, the Edinburgh printing gives way to the London with No. 36. Whether numbers later than these thirty-five were printed in Edinburgh, Greenough and Fletcher have been in doubt. But Greenough ascertained that, except for L No. 6 and E No. 35 which appeared in but one of the two editions, the Edinburgh numbers are close reprints of the London.

The problem of the "imperfects" following No. 35 has received even less attention than that of the Edinburgh edition. None of the known copies in Great Britain has "imperfects," and bibliographers say nothing of them. But of the eight important American copies of Volume VII, all but two, Tr-d and Tr-m, are made up chiefly of "imperfects." And the same is true of S Volume VIII. Professor Trent suggested in a note, transcribed in the Bibliographical Note, Facsimile Book 19, that they may have been intended for the provinces, and Professor Fletcher asked if they were not intended for the colonies.[32] Both he and Greenough thought they may have been what journalists call "ready-print," for local publishers to complete with appropriate dates, advertisements, and colophons. Fletcher further suggested that they may be pirated copies or copies printed to fill up incomplete volumes.

The very fecundity of Professor Fletcher's suggestions shows that he has no solution. Yet a slight comparison of "perfects" and "imperfects" puts it beyond question that they are from a single setting of type and, therefore, that the "imperfects" were not piracies or reprints (from new type) to fill out volumes. The omission, from lists of errata, of errors appearing only in the "perfects" indicates that the "perfects" and the "imperfects" were printed at approximately the same time. It is prob-

[32] *Notes and Queries*, CLXVI, 218 ff.

able that caption, date, advertisement, and colophon type was transferred to new issues as soon as the old were printed; but it would have been impossible to keep the old text in type very long after the printing. It should be added that sometimes both inner and outer form pages of the "imperfects" show modification (when *FINIS* comes on the third page) and, therefore, that the "imperfects" were printed as a complete unit separate from the "perfects."

The "ready-print" theory is nearer the truth. But, though the outer form pages had blanks which might have been completed in the provinces or the colonies, no such completed copies are known, and the use of *FINIS* in the colophon frequently precluded insertion of advertisements. A final difficulty for all these suggestions is that the modifications do not appear in earlier volumes but date exactly from the withdrawal of the Edinburgh edition.

So far as I know, the question has never been raised whether there may be some connection between the Edinburgh edition (or its cessation) and the "imperfects." That there is such a connection becomes obvious from a careful collation of "perfects" and "imperfects."

Why, Fletcher has asked, should Defoe have stopped the Edinburgh edition before the two-year subscriptions expired? But he did not stop distributing the *Review* in Edinburgh. The *Scots Postman*, July 29—August 1, 1710, advertises that such "Subscribers to Mr. De Foe's *Reviews* as are in the Country please leave a Note at Mrs. Anderson's Shop, informing where the *Reviews* shall be left for them so as to come to their hands."[33] What Defoe did was to supply his readers in Edinburgh with the London edition. With No. 36, the first number after the Edinburgh edition ceased, he began a series of changes to make the London printing acceptable in Edinburgh. He must have thought the advertisements the most "Londonish" thing about the *Review*, since with No. 36, A, M, S, Te, Y-1, and Y-2 omit the advertisement which is in Tr-d and Tr-m and become "imperfects."

Defoe had not very clearly understood his dilemma. For No. 36 differed sharply in typography from the Edinburgh numbers and had, moreover, the imprint (colophon) of John Baker at the Black Boy in Paternoster Row. Worse still, it bore the same pagination as E No. 35 and a date three days earlier than that of E No. 35. Under those cir-

[33] Lee, *Daniel Defoe*, I, 176; *Notes and Queries*, 3d ser., IX, 347.

cumstances it is probable that the omission of the advertisement, "A New Treatise of the Venereal Disease," did little to mollify Edinburgh readers. Two such readers at least have recorded their irritation by vigorous attempts to blot out dates in Nos. 36–37 and imprint in Nos. 36–39. That seems to me a significant fact; M and Te, two-thirds of the known copies preceded by the Edinburgh numbers, irritated readers into action. The third copy, A, lacks the Edinburgh No. 35.

Their persistence was rewarded. With No. 40, by which there had been time for echoes of dissatisfaction to reach Defoe from the north, a second modification occurred: the date line and the colophon were left blank in A, M, and Te. Professor Greenough, from examining A, thought that the colophon might simply have been trimmed. Te, however, lacks both the colophon and the rule above it, showing that it never had the colophon. S, Y-1, Y-2 retain date and colophon (Baker's imprint) in No. 40 but drop them in No. 41. From No. 41 to the end of the volume, none of these copies has dates except in three or four numbers, and from No. 45 all have *FINIS* in the colophon, except M No. 104 and S, Y-1, and Y-2 No. 148, which have Baker's imprint.

At first there seemed to be two classes of "imperfects": extreme "imperfects" (A and Te) and semi-"imperfects" (M, S, Y-1, and Y-2). It turns out that whenever M, S, Y-1, and Y-2 have dates and colophon, they are identical in advertisements with Tr-d and Tr-m; that is, they are "perfects." And whenever they have any of the marks of the "imperfects," as in Nos. 43 and 139 where they have dates but lack colophon, they are identical with A and Te. There are not, after No. 35, three kinds of numbers; there are only two, "perfects" and "imperfects." There are, however, three kinds of bound volumes: (1) those, like A and Te, made up entirely of "imperfects"; those like Tr-d and Tr-m made up entirely of "perfects"; and those, like M, S, Y-1, and Y-2, made up chiefly of "imperfects" but having an occasional "perfect."

More study would doubtless show whether the "perfects" or the "imperfects" were printed first. One reason for avoiding the terms "reprints" and "seconds" is to leave the question of priority unprejudiced. Since the matter of the *Review* was seldom "time" matter, there was no particular reason why the "imperfects" should not have been hurried off to Edinburgh and the provinces before the "perfects" were printed. Brackets about the figures of the numbers, missing in Nos. 104 and 129

of the "imperfects," prove nothing. More significant are the misprints in some copies of Volume VII, No. 50, page 196; they seem to indicate that the "perfects" were printed first. A single sentence in column 2, lines 8–9, appears in three states.

1. "I shall ler [*sic*] you see a little more of this in / my next." (Tr-d and Tr-m, "perfects.")

2. "I shall let you see a little more of this in/my. [*sic*]" (A and Te, "imperfects.")

3. "I shall let you see a little more of this in / my next." (M, S, Y-1, and Y-2 "imperfects.")

It will be observed that neither of the two errors is due to a mere displacement of type. As the "perfects" were not likely printed between two series of "imperfects," they must have been printed either first or last of the three. If they were printed last, we must suppose either (1) that the printing began with the sentence correct and that *two* dislocations were carelessly restored by the printer or (2) that the correct version was printed between two incorrect. The simpler assumption, since it implies but one blunder after the type was set, is that the printing began with the misprint "ler" in the "perfects"; that, in the correction of "ler" to "let," the word "next" was omitted; and that the correct version (in S, Y-1, and Y-2) is the final one. If my deduction is valid, copies for Scotland and the provinces were printed *after* the regular edition. But since they were undated, they could not be late, no matter when they reached their destination.[84]

It is curious that Te, through both Volumes VI and VII, should differ from S, Y-1, and Y-2; and that A (which agrees here with Te), M (which usually agrees with Te, though not here), and Te should further differ from S, Y-1, and Y-2 in beginning Volume VII with Edinburgh numbers. The fact that S, Y-1, and Y-2 are identical throughout Volume VII indicates that they may have been made up and bound in London from copies in Baker's printing house, where the surplus copies, with a few exceptions, were "imperfects." This is quite different from Fletcher's theory, already disposed of, that the "imperfects" were printed up merely to complete volumes. Defoe repeatedly advertised the bound volumes and in the Preface of Volume V remarked

[84] No. 53, p. 208, has the first list of errata after No. 50, but neither it nor any subsequent list corrects the errors in No. 50.

that Volumes IV and V had sold relatively better by the volume than by the single copy.

That No. 36 began the modification of the London edition is enough evidence that No. 35 was the last number *printed* in Edinburgh. The advertisement in the *Scots Postman* (July 29—August 1, 1710), quoted above, proves that Edinburgh readers were still getting the *Review*, nearly two months after the Edinburgh printing ceased; and the "imperfects" comprising almost the whole of S Volume VIII indicate that the *Review* was, in its modified state, being sent to them for the third year. No "imperfects" of Volume [IX] have been reported. It may be that after the imposition of the periodical tax, August 1, 1712, Defoe did not try to serve Edinburgh. The future of the *Review* was uncertain in London, and though Defoe was in Scotland in the fall and early winter of 1712–13, nothing is known of the *Review*'s circulation there except that prior to 1833 Lord Eldin of Edinburgh owned a copy of Volume [IX].

MISSING AND DUPLICATE NUMBERS VOLUME [IX]

Volume [IX] is the rarest of all parts of the *Review*. It exists in only two copies, BM-c and Tr-m, and neither is complete. BM-c lacks eighteen numbers, and Tr-m lacks two, Nos. 80–81. The former is in BM-c, but no copy of No. 81 has been discovered. Professor Trent and others have searched for it; Professors Fletcher and Greenough and I have appealed in vain for information about it.[35] We should be inclined to doubt its existence except that a gap in pagination, numbering, and dating is left for it between Nos. 80 and 82. And in Tr-m the edges show where presumably Nos. 80–81, each a single leaf, have been torn out. A slight fragment of what should have been No. 81 remains. On it six successive lines in the inner margin of the recto begin with the following: "th" or "ti," "I," "begi," "say," "to," and an incomplete vertical stroke. Eleven letters, indubitably; three short words, possibly! A scientist might recreate the whole dinosaur from this fossil; but an unimaginative student of literature can make nothing of it.

[35] *Notes and Queries*, CLXVI, 218 ff.; London *Times Literary Supplement*, Feb. 15, 1934, p. 108; *ibid.*, June 11, 1938, p. 408; *ibid.*, June 18, 1938, p. 424; *ibid.*, July 30, 1938, p. 508.

A slightly better clue to its contents is the opening sentence of No. 82: "I Laid down in my last but this one short Proposition relating to the Peace [of Utrecht] . . . *That whatever this Peace be in the CONDITIONS, it is our Duty to make it happy to us in the Consequences* . . ." Unfortunately the proposition is almost identical with that laid down at the end of No. 80. One is tempted to think that instead of "in my last but this one short Proposition," Defoe meant to say, "in my last but one this short Proposition."

Probably the lost No. 81, like Nos. 80 and 82, deals with the Treaty of Utrecht which was then concluding. That seems all we are likely ever to know about it. Professor Newton suggests to me, "as the purest sort of guesswork," that a Whig reader may have become so enraged at Defoe's change of front in arguing for the Treaty that he tore out of Tr-m Nos. 80–81. The volume is otherwise a sound one from which leaves could not be easily removed by accident.

Another problem presented in Volume [IX] is that of Nos. 89 and 91. They exist only in Tr-m and therefore have not been considered by previous biographers of Defoe, though they are essential to a complete understanding of his trouble with the Court of the Queen's Bench in April–May, 1713. I am indebted to Professor Newton for discovery of the fact that these numbers, both containing "The Humble Petition of *Daniel De Foe*, Prisoner in the *Queen's Bench* Prison," are almost identical. In previous issues of the *Review* (Nos. 84–85), Defoe, who was maliciously charged with writing in favor of the Pretender, indiscreetly reflected upon the Lord Chief Justice Parker and was committed to the Queen's Bench prison for libel. All this is well known.[86] But, as Professor Newton points out to me, neither Dottin nor Sutherland noticed that while Defoe was in prison he wrote in No. 89 (April 28) a public apology. That, however, was not thoroughgoing enough for the Court, and under pressure (Professor Newton thinks) Defoe republished the apology in No. 91 (May 5) "with several notable changes in wording, as if dictated by the judges." Most significant was the insertion of this sentence:

I saw likewise, That publick Reflections upon Prosecutors or Witnesses, or upon Prosecutions; and publishing Defences against Judicial Proceeding . . . ought not to be suffered; because it tends to prepossess Juries, to

[86] Dottin, *De Foe et ses romans*, I, 218; Sutherland, *Defoe*, p. 198.

anticipate the publick Justice, and to prejudice the Minds of the People . . . in case upon a full and equal Examination, it should prove that the Prosecutions are just.

Defoe further omitted the suggestion that his indiscretion had been "innocently, and unwarily done," and, whereas he had first said the apology was demanded by the judges, he now said it was voluntary.

So much for Professor Newton's solution. I have but one comment—or question. Dottin and Sutherland, without very specific references to authority, say that Defoe was released on May 2. But if so, why was he still abjectly petitioning on May 5?

MATTERS CHIEFLY BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

This Introduction and the nine bibliographical notes do not pretend to have solved all the bibliographical and literary questions about the *Review*. It seemed advisable, however, to preserve what has come to light in the process of selecting texts for reproduction. Studies of the *Review* have, hitherto, been largely incidental to searching for historical and biographical data; no adequate study of the *Review* itself exists. Perhaps Professor Newton will publish one. If we except Professor Trent, the writer most intimately acquainted with the *Review* was William Lee, to whom we owe a great deal for his pioneering in eighteenth-century periodicals, especially Defoe's; in his bibliography he gives a brief but accurate account of the *Review*. Dottin's is less accurate.[37] He gives wrong dates for the first number, the last number of Volume II, the last number of *The Little Review*, and the first number of Volume [IX] and the wrong number of pages for Volume [IX]. The only bibliographical account fuller than Lee's and as accurate is the one by Professor Fletcher, and that, as he has frankly stated, is based upon a rapid examination of a few copies, two of them fortunately together.[38] It is likely, then, that whatever I say, whether it be true or significant, will have the virtue of novelty.

PRINTERS AND SELLERS

The printer of the first six volumes of the *Review* was John Matthews of Pilkington Court in Little Britain. He should not be confused

[37] Lee, *Daniel Defoe*, I, xxii ff.; Dottin, *De Foe et ses romans*, III, 809 ff.
[38] *Notes and Queries*, CLXVI, 218 ff.

with his son, John, the unfortunate printer of *Vox Populi Vox Dei,* or with Emanuel, possibly another son. During Defoe's frequent absences, Matthews must have had considerable responsibility in determining the order of printing Defoe's manuscripts, in proofreading, and the like. Dottin miscalls him Morphew,[39] and curiously Professor Greenough in his manuscript notes once makes the same error. Frequent notices make clear, however, that Matthews was the sole printer until, about a month after Sacheverell's trial, he was kidnapped by a "Party of . . . the defeated *High-Church* Army" and so intimidated that Defoe was forced to place the *Review* in the hands of John Baker, who was not to "be biass'd, terrify'd, or any way prevail'd upon to keep it back."[40] From Volume VII, No. 13, April 25, 1710, to the final number of Volume [IX], the *Review* bore the imprint of John Baker at the Black Boy in Paternoster Row. It is possible that Matthews may have had some share in the *Review* even while Baker was printing it. A correspondent who "asked Mr. *Baker*" how to communicate with Defoe was advised to leave a letter "at Mr. *Matthews*'s in *Pilkington Court* in *Little Britain.*"[41]

The booksellers "of *London* and *Westminster*" who sold the *Review* are apparently not listed. But during the hostility attending the Sacheverell trial, when copies were not to be had "either of the Hawkers, or Shops," Defoe announced that customers could always get them of "Mr. *Nathaniel Cliff*'s, Bookseller in *Cheapside* . . . and at Mrs. Pike [or Pye] at . . . the *Golden Perriwig* at *Charing Cross.*"[42] A challenge to "honest Mr. *Morphew*" to say whether Defoe had had a shilling from the sale of the *Review* in the previous four years seems to imply that Morphew was one of the sellers, if not the chief seller, of the *Review.*[43] Perhaps the others listed with Matthews and Morphew as authorized in 1707 to take subscriptions for Defoe's *History of the Union* also handled the *Review.*[44]

The *Review* was printed in Scotland (1709–1710) by the "Heirs and Successors of *Andrew Anderson,* Printer to the Queens most Excellent Majesty." Andrew Anderson's heirs and successors were Agnes Campbell Anderson, his widow, who was still making an attempt to

[39] Vol. I, p. 191.
[40] Vol. VII, No. 13.
[41] Vol. VII, No. 51.
[42] Vol. VI, No. 149, and Vol. VII, Nos. 3, 4, etc.
[43] Vol. VII, No. 17.
[44] *Term Catalogues,* III (London, 1906), 567.

maintain the forty-year monopoly granted to her husband by Charles II in 1671. Though after Volume VI, No. 7, the Anderson imprint ceased, there is ample evidence that Mrs. Anderson printed the *Review* till Defoe discontinued the Edinburgh edition and that afterward she was Edinburgh agent for the *Review* which Defoe was sending up printed from London. The claim of a rival, that she was guilty of sedition for printing the *Review* a whole year, she countered by citing its circulating unchecked in England. As for his charge that she printed it very badly, she replied, untruthfully, that Defoe had been in Edinburgh that year and had "corrected every paper himself."[45] Mr. Couper thinks it probable that the *Review* was printed at the press "in the College at the Kirk o'Field." It was sold at Mrs. Anderson's shop north of the Cross and by Mr. Adam Blackadder at the Caledonia Coffee House.[46]

THE PAPER AND THE PRINTING

Defoe makes an interesting comment on the format of his paper by remarking that some whom the church rulers have not thought fit to set in a white sheet "I have caus'd to stand in my *White Half-Sheet.*"[47] The *Review* is throughout a quarto. Wherever they have been examined, chain lines are horizontal and watermarks are in the inner margin, with two exceptions: Tr-m Volume V and Tr-m Volume [IX]. Tr-m Volume V is said to have vertical chain lines in Nos. 1–2, 5–6, 22–32, 38–55, 57–60, 137, and 148. Miss Evelyn Boyce, of the Columbia University Press, who has generously done all the checking of the paper for me, reports that, in the S and Tr-d copies of Volume V chain lines, though very faint, are wherever discernible horizontal. One would like to know why, if a different kind of paper—whether with the chain lines running the long way of the sheet or of an unusual size—was used, that paper does not show up in all copies and especially why it should appear in a long series of consecutive issues in one copy. One is tempted to suspect that Tr-m was printed at

[45] See the advertisement in Edinburgh Vol. VI, No. 147, reprinted in Facsimile Book 16; Couper, *The Edinburgh Periodical Press*, I, 237–238; and Lee, *Daniel Defoe*, I, 176.

[46] *The Edinburgh Periodical Press*, I, 22, 32; *Review*, Edinburgh Vol. VI, Nos. 1–3, 5–7.

[47] Vol. VI, No. 90.

a later time to fill out bound volumes; but it is obviously from the same type as S and Tr-d, and the printer could not have kept hundreds of pages in type at one time.

Pages differ in size from copy to copy and from volume to volume. In Volume I, the height varies from 8¼ inches in Te-2 to 8 11/16 inches in Tr-d; and the width, from 6 inches in Te-1 to 6½ inches in S. The original sheet must have measured at least 17½ × 13 inches and probably was nearer 17¾ × 13¾ inches.

In Volume [IX] the single leaves of Tr-m measure 9⅛ × 7⅛ inches. The British Museum Catalogue describes BM-c as a folio. In Tr-m the chain lines are horizontal and the watermarks wherever discernible are in the outer margin.[48] The volume, then, like the earlier volumes appears to be a quarto, though the sheets must have measured at least 18¼ × 14¼ inches.

The *Review* followed conventional eighteenth-century practice in having signatures in the first half only of a gathering. That the need for them was slight, especially after the reduction of the paper to two leaves, is shown by the errors in their use. They could have been but unreliable guides in folding and binding. After Volume II they were discontinued except in those preliminaries which are made up of four leaves.

The *Review*, while it consisted of four pages, must have been printed by the method known as imposition by half-sheets. The type for outer form and inner form pages was imposed simultaneously. A whole sheet was then printed on one side and, after drying, was turned end for end and printed on the other side. When the sheet was cut in two, the printer had two copies. Unless he followed this method, he must have run his press at half capacity or have gone to the needless expense of two settings of type. If he had done the latter, we should discover typographical differences in copies.

When an issue was completed, the printer removed the type of the text proper, leaving intact in each of the four pages whatever would be used in the next issue. That included pagination, numbering, caption, dating, signatures (in Volumes I–II), advertisements, and colo-

[48] Miss Boyce reports "anchors" in the outer margin of the leaf in Nos. 24, 27, 34, 37, 38, etc.; and "fleurs-de-lis," in Nos. 26, 28-30, etc. She has checked nearly the whole volume for chain lines.

phon. Some of these, like the numbering, pagination, and dating, had to be slightly altered each time; and carelessness in altering them led to numerous errors.

ERRORS IN PAGINATION

Every volume of the *Review* except Edinburgh Volume VI has errors in pagination. Some are glaring, continuous, and confusing. Though many are mere misprints, the most common is the "fourth page" error. Because the fourth page was chiefly advertisements, the type for which was used over and over without resetting, the printer frequently forgot to bring the pagination up-to-date. Five "fourth page" errors occur in Volume III: pages [36], [260], [428], [564], and [588] are mispaged 32, 256, 424, 560, and 584, respectively. Sometimes the "fourth page" error occurs with variations. In Volume II, page [440] is mispaged 436, but the printer, transferring type for the next fourth page, failed to observe that error and changed the last digit only, with the result that page [444] is mispaged 434. In *The Little Review* a "fourth page" error, a failure to notice that error, and another "fourth page" error led to mispaging [80], [84], and [88] as 76, 74, and 74, respectively. In the Edinburgh edition, where relatively little space was given to advertisements, the "fourth page" error was not so likely to occur. As a matter of fact, no errors in numbering and pagination have been found in it. A single error in dating (Vol. VI, No. 144) was corrected in the press.

Errors in the first three pages were less frequent, probably because the printer, having to make other changes, was less likely to overlook pagination. In successive issues of Volume II, pages [301] and [305], both first pages, were mispaged 331 and 335, respectively. The second error doubtless resulted from the first. A "second page" error occurs in Volume VIII; page [390] is mispaged 290, and, in consequence, page [394] is mispaged 294. These errors show a curious detachment on the part of the printer, who ignores the lateral relation of the pages of an issue for the vertical relation of first page to first page, second page to second page, and the like. Awareness of both relations appears in Volume VII, where pages [601–603], [605–607], and [609–620] are mispaged 561–563, 565–567, and 569–580, respectively.

But in that chaos, pages 604 and 608, both fourth pages, are paged correctly, possibly through the influence each time of a preceding fourth page. These contradictory tendencies suggest that sometimes a single printer may have imposed all four pages and that sometimes he may have had a helper.

When an issue was misnumbered, it was likely to be mispaged accordingly. Sometimes, as in No. 100, Volume VII, the pagination was corrected by reference to the numbering. In the January supplement to Volume I, the third sheet bears the signature D and is paged as though it were the fourth sheet. An intricate series of errors in the September supplement arises, as is explained in the Bibliographical Note to Volume I, from a simple error in beginning the pagination of the inner form of sheet C. In the preceding sheet (B), page [11] is mispaged 14; the recto of leaf two and the verso of its conjugate leaf (three) were imposed side by side in the inner form, and the printer paged them alike.

Errors in pagination (as in dating) were sometimes corrected while an issue was in press and sometimes in subsequent issues; many were continued uncorrected. Four of the nine volumes end with erroneous pagination, indicating that correct pagination was not considered very important. Though Mrs. Anderson's assertion that Defoe attended her press every day and corrected the proofs will not bear scrutiny, Defoe was particular about the printing of his essays. In his lists of errata, he often corrects minor misprints. But sometimes in those lists he refers to pages by their incorrect pagination without even seeming to be aware that it is incorrect.

Since Defoe seems frequently to have sent copy for three numbers at a time, it is possible that sometimes all were composed before any were printed and that errors may have arisen from confusion about which was to appear first. In S No. 117 of Volume VIII and in the Texas single copy of that number, the pagination is identical with that of No. 118, including an error in the first page. Tr-m No. 117 is paged correctly. The only explanation I can offer is that No. 117 was numbered and paged to become No. 118; that, when it was shifted to become No. 117, its pagination was not corrected till S and Te had been printed; and that then the pagination type was transferred, error and all, to the type pages of No. 118 which were lying ready.

THE PRELIMINARIES

The preliminary in periodicals is written and printed after most, if not all, of the issues have appeared. One fortunate consequence is that the preliminary in the *Review* (except for Edinburgh Volume VI) included the title leaf as the first leaf of the gathering, conjugate with the last leaf. Any copy which has the Preface is almost certain to have the title leaf, though Te-2 Volume I has lost the last leaf of the Preface without losing the title leaf. In the Edinburgh Volume VI, the preliminary consists of a separate leaf for the title and two conjugate leaves for the Preface; as a consequence, BA, Te, and Y have lost the title page, and the Trent Collection has a stray one. S is the only copy of the volume with title page.

An interesting procedure of Defoe's, how original I do not know, was to issue the preliminary as one of the regular triweekly issues of the *Review*. He began that with Volume II and, except for Volume [IX] which was unfinished and therefore had no preliminary, continued the procedure to the end, including Edinburgh Volume VI. This explains the puzzling gap of a single publication day between the final number of one volume and the first of the next. In the last number of Volume II, Defoe explained that the next would "contain the Preface and Index." The preliminary of Volume IV was delayed till after Volume V, No. 1, which explains the delay. The gap comes, not between Volumes IV and V, but between Nos. 1 and 2 of Volume V. The preliminary of Volume V has a list of errata for the final number, which had appeared two days earlier. The preliminary of Volume VIII Defoe refers to in Volume [IX], No. 4, as "the *Review* of July 31." Another puzzling consequence of this procedure is that several of the title pages bear the price mark, "2*d*," following the imprint. Two pence was the price of the preliminary, not of the whole volume. The preliminaries of Volumes IV and Edinburgh VI, consisting of but two and three leaves, respectively, may have sold for a penny. That a penny was the price of the regular issues is evident from the remark in Volume [IX], No. 1, that two issues at three halfpence would cost the same for the week as three issues at the previous price.[49]

[49] See also Vol. I, No. 5.

IMPORTANT SETS OF THE "REVIEW"

The exact contents of known sets of the *Review* are listed in the nine bibliographical notes. But it may be useful to record here what has come to light incidentally about the history of sets.

The three approximately complete sets, that is, those lacking only a volume or so, are the Crossley in the British Museum; the Trent in the Boston Public Library; and the Shaw in the library of Mr. Arch W. Shaw, Winnetka, Illinois.

The Crossley set has the best-known history. George Chalmers (1742–1825) of Edinburgh, author of the earliest biography of Defoe (1785), had formerly owned Volumes I–VIII. James Crossley (1800–1883) bought them for his large library in Manchester at the Chalmers sale in 1841. The price, according to Lowndes, was £41. In 1861, Crossley acquired Volume [IX] from David Laing, Edinburgh antiquarian, who had bought it at Lord Eldin's sale in Edinburgh in 1833. William Lee, in recording Crossley's acquisition of it, called it the only known copy of Volume [IX] and a complete one; but it lacks eighteen numbers. Otherwise the nine volumes are a complete "London" set of the *Review*, with one of the two known copies of *The Little Review*. It would be gratuitous to complain of its lacking the Edinburgh edition.[50]

Of Mr. Shaw's set, Volumes I–V, VII, and *The Little Review* had been Crossley's, too, and passed to the Huth Library from the Riggall sale in 1901.[51] *Book-Prices Current*, so far as I can discover, says nothing of the Riggall sale or of the copy of *The Little Review*. All these volumes have, I believe, been washed. At least, they have smooth unfoxed pages, gilt edges, and ornate calf bindings by Rivière. The Huth bookplates appear to have been inserted since the rebinding. Volumes VI and VIII, solid volumes in old calf with the names "Wm Douglas" and "Cavers" on back flyleaf and covers, were from the John Taylor Brown Library (Edinburgh) which Sotheby's sold in 1903. Quaritch bought the augmented set of eight volumes at Sotheby's sale of the Huth

[50] The evidence for these data is: (1) A notation in the Crossley Vol. [IX] (British Museum); (2) Lowndes, *Bibliographer's Manual*, I (London, 1858), 612; (3) Lee, *Daniel Defoe*, I, 86, 204; (4) a manuscript note by J. T. B. [James T. Bell] in Vol. III of the set in Yale University Library. The note is quoted in Footnote 56.

[51] I am indebted to Professor Newton and to Messrs. Bernard Quaritch Ltd. for this information from the *Huth Sale Catalogue*, No. 2164.

Library in June, 1912.[52] Mr. Shaw tells me that the "set was bought at auction something like twenty five years ago through Quaritch."

Mr. Shaw's set lacks Volume [IX], and its copies of Volumes VII and VIII are made up chiefly of "imperfects"; but it has the only copy of *The Little Review* besides the Crossley. It has, moreover, a small volume, labeled on the shelfback, *Defoe Tracts 1701–10*, which is a collection of twenty-two numbers of Volumes VII and VIII of the *Review*. A letter from Messrs. Bernard Quaritch Ltd. suggests, "from Sotheby's cataloguing," that they may have been duplicates extracted from the Huth set. The oversize cover and its label indicate that they had been originally on another book.

The remarkable collection of Professor W. P. Trent has in recent years passed to the Boston Public Library. It lacks *The Little Review* and Volume III, and its old calf bindings are in need of repair. But it has parts of three sets in the thirteen volumes. Its Volume [IX] lacks but two numbers. There are, first, Volumes I–II with the bookplate of Henry Labouchere. Then there are Volumes I–II and V–VII with the signatures "Benj. Dobels 1788" and "Susanna Edwards." These may possibly be the five volumes in a "bundle lot" mentioned by Dobell in 1913.[53] And finally, there are Volumes IV–[IX], the exciting purchase of which Professor Trent tells in memoranda transcribed in the bibliographical notes in Facsimile Books 19 and 22. The Boston Public Library has not yet decided upon a system of cataloguing for the set and, at the moment, is in the anomalous position of regarding the "Dobels-Edwards" copy as primary in Volumes I–II and as secondary in Volumes V–VII.

In addition to these three part-sets, Trent had acquired several single numbers of other volumes; a title leaf of Edinburgh Volume VI; and two Dublin reprints: one dated, July 2, 1706, Volume III, and another unnumbered and undated. If the date was copied from the London original, the first would be No. 79. Both Dublin copies have been mislaid, so that for the present we can learn nothing more about them. They are the only copies known to have been reprinted

[52] *Book-Prices Current*, Vol. XVII (London, 1903), p. 338, No. 3289; Vol. XXVI (1912), pp. 595 ff., No. 6907. The Brown Library had copies of Vols. III and VII which I have been unable to trace.

[53] *Book-Auction Records*, Vol. X (London, 1913) for 1912–1913, p. 320.

in Defoe's time elsewhere than in London and Edinburgh, except for a number of Volume VII reprinted in Boston in 1721.[54]

Three other sets have lesser claims to completeness. One belongs to the newspaper collection made by Charles Burney, brother of Fanny Burney; it passed to the British Museum shortly after the collector's death in 1817. It has most of Volumes I–VII and a few numbers of Volumes VIII–[IX].

The set in the Aitken Collection, now in the University of Texas Library, consists of Volumes I–IV and VI–VII and a duplicate Volume I. Volumes I–IV and VII compose the set which Dobell bought for £23 at the Edward Arber sale in 1913. A notation of Mr. G. A. Aitken upon his list of books reads: "This set of the 'Review' was bought at Prof. Arber's Sale, 1913."[55] That may not hold for Volume VI or the duplicate Volume I. The latter has the name "James T. Bell," probably a signature, on a front flyleaf.[56] On the verso of the title page, in very ornate script, are the names "John Clarkson" and "John Clarkson Junior." The volume had been rebound, in brown leather, probably in the nineteenth century. The other volumes the University of Texas has had bound in maroon leather by Rivière. Volume VI is of the Edinburgh edition; Volume VII begins with the thirty-five Edinburgh numbers and continues to the end with those London numbers modified for Scotland and the provinces.

The Yale set consists of Volumes I–III, V (No. 124 only), and VI–VII, donated in 1907–1909 by Mr. Henry R. Wagner, economist and

[54] Greenough in *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXVIII, 461.

[55] *Book-Prices Current*, Vol. XXVII (1913), p. 477, No. 6414, and p. 543, No. 7283; *Book-Auction Records*, Vol. X for 1912-1913, p. 320. Dobell announced at the sale that he had five similar volumes bought in a "bundle lot" at 10 shillings. Are these the "Dobels-Edwards" volumes (I-II, V-VII) which went to Trent? For Aitken's memorandum upon his set, I am indebted to Mr. Donald Coney, Librarian of the University of Texas.

[56] The Yale University Library Vol. III has the following manuscript note by Bell about the rarity of the *Review:* "These four Volumes of Defoe's political paper, '*The Review*' are of the utmost rarity. Only one complete copy of the eight Volumes I believe is known to exist; it belonged originally to George Chalmers & is now I think in the British Museum. David Laing had only 2 volumes, & neither Lord Cockburn nor Lord Rutherford who were great collectors of Defoe's works had any portion of the Book. The present volume (the third) is of special interest, as having been published in the years before the Union with Scotland, one half of this Volume is entirely devoted to papers recommending that measure. J. T. B. [James T. Bell]."

collector. Mr. Wagner bought them in London in 1905 or 1906. On the title page of Volume III is the name "P. Lawson," and on the first page of the Preface of Volume VI, the name "John McKenzie."[57] Another Volume VII bears the date "1885" on the "Yale College Library" bookplate. Volume VI, of the Edinburgh edition, and both copies of Volume VII are identical with Mr. Shaw's. The Wagner Volume VII, No. 5, has had inserted a new leaf for one lost.

Oxford University has in the Bodleian Library Volumes I–III and a single number of Volume VII. Professor D. Nichol Smith of Merton College, Oxford, owns 320 numbers of Volumes I–III and VII–VIII. Volume I has the five monthly supplements, and Volume III is complete with title page and Preface. Harvard University has Volume I and most of Volume II. Indiana University has Volume I and parts of Volume II. Professor Emeritus A. L. Bouton of New York University has a copy of Volume I in storage. The Boston Athenæum Library has Edinburgh Volume VI with the signatures "J. Franklin" and "Andrew Craigies Book 1756."[58] It was given to the Athenæum by Ezekiel Price Greenleaf in 1853. The American Antiquarian Society Library of Worcester, Massachusetts, has an incomplete Volume VII with most of the thirty-five rare Edinburgh numbers. Through Professor Newton, another copy of Volume VII with the thirty-five Edinburgh numbers has been reported. It is part of "Historical Tracts 1561–1800 collected and annotated by Stuart J. Reid Volume CCLXXXVIII. 1711 (3) The gift of Mrs. Peter Redpath to the Redpath Library, McGill University, Montreal . . . Printed by the donor . . . MCMI."

Scattering numbers, including many of Volume VII, are in the Henry E. Huntington Library, and, too late for further inquiry, there has come from Mr. H. Bergholz information of several single numbers in the British Museum and of a single number (No. 94) of Volume III and Nos. 1–17 of Edinburgh Volume VI in the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh.[59] Mr. Bergholz has the additional

[57] See the memorandum of James T. Bell in the preceding footnote.

[58] The first page of the Preface has been reprinted by Greenough in *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXVII, opposite 469.

[59] See a letter by Mr. Bergholz in the London *Times Literary Supplement*, June 18, 1938, p. 424. The Edinburgh numbers have not previously come to the attention of Defoe scholars.

information that he has been "unable to trace any other extant issues, in spite of inquiries at many libraries, notably the following:—Dublin Public Library, Cambridge University Library, Manchester John Rylands, Public and Portico Libraries, Rochdale Libraries, as well as Paris and German libraries." For all our inquiries, unreported sets and part sets doubtless exist.

The distribution of sets is puzzling. The Crossley set came from the libraries of George Chalmers and David Laing in Edinburgh. Chalmers was born only eleven years after Defoe's death and before his works became collectors' items. If Chalmers got his set in Scotland, we would expect it to have an Edinburgh Volume VI and the Edinburgh numbers of Volume VII; but it is wholly a London set. The only volumes of the Edinburgh edition which I have traced to a Scottish owner is the Shaw Volume VI. How long it had been in Edinburgh before John Taylor Brown sold it in 1903 I do not know. The Boston Athenæum copy of Edinburgh Volume VI belonged to a Boston family prior to 1756, possibly as early as 1721. If, as Professor Greenough suspects,[60] the owner was James Franklin and if he was the Boston printer who in 1721 reissued Edinburgh No. 14 of Volume VII as "News from the Moon," he must have had also a copy of Volume VII with the Edinburgh numbers. One would be tempted to suspect that that Volume VII was the American Antiquarian Society copy, the only copy of this volume known to have been in America earlier than the twentieth century. It has a manuscript note, probably written before 1820, by Isaiah Thomas, printer of Worcester and founder of the Society, saying that it had been in his library and that it "cost 3 dols." The price in dollars indicates that he bought it in the United States. But it now lacks, among many other numbers, the Edinburgh No. 14, of which "News from the Moon" was a reprint.

The fact that the Boston Athenæum and the American Antiquarian Society copies of Volumes VI and VII, respectively, were in the United States before the recent vogue of collecting suggests that they were brought over from Scotland by immigrants. If the *Review* had circulated in the colonies, it would probably have come from London rather than Edinburgh. In view of the scarcity of Volumes VIII and [IX], it is astonishing that ten copies of Volume VII have survived. Eight of them

[60] *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXVIII, 469 ff.

are in the United States, and, for several months in the present year, six of them were together for collation and photographing in the Columbia University Library. I have no explanation to offer of their abundance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many institutions and people have collaborated in this publication. It was made possible by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which is not, however, responsible for any statements or views expressed herein.

The John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation gave me, a number of years ago, my first real opportunity to study the *Review*— in the British Museum. R. D. Carmichael, Dean of the Graduate School, and the Committee on Graduate Research, University of Illinois, granted funds for my expenses in the collation of the sets and in the editing. That included payments to Mr. French R. Fogle, who assisted me.

The generosity of owners in lending their sets of the *Review* has already been mentioned. But they have done a great deal more. Mr. Arch W. Shaw, who from the first has been sympathetic with this project, welcomed me to his library in Winnetka, Illinois, where I made a preliminary investigation of his fine set. The Boston Public Library has likewise been most helpful. In 1930, Mr. Charles Belden, then Director, and Mr. Michael McCarthy, then Chief Classifier, reported upon the Trent Collection; and within the past year Mr. Zoltán Haraszti, Keeper of Rare Books, and his assistants, Miss Helen Symonds and Miss Harriet Swift, have taken immense pains in checking the Collection. Similarly careful checking upon the Aitken-Texas set I owe to Mr. Donald Coney, Librarian of the University of Texas, Austin, and to another Mr. McCarthy. Mr. Andrew Keogh, Yale University Librarian, had made for me a most useful check of the Yale set by Dr. Henry C. Hutchins, Research Associate in Yale University. Dr. Hutchins thereby increased my long-standing debt to him.

Thanks are due the directors of the British Museum for the privilege of reprinting from their sets certain pages of *The Little Review* and of Volume [IX]. For careful investigations of these sets I am in-

debted to my colleague, Professor Walter Graham, and to Professor R. F. Jones, Washington University, St. Louis.

The following have reported upon their holdings of the *Review* and have subsequently answered numerous questions concerning them: Mr. H. Thomas, Deputy Keeper, Department of Printed Books, British Museum; Mr. G. R. Lomer, Librarian, McGill University, Montreal; Mr. Lyle H. Wright, Assistant Bibliographer, Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California; Miss Elinor Gregory, Librarian, and Miss Marjorie Crandall, Reference Librarian, Boston Athenæum Library, Boston; Mr. Stephen Wright, Assistant Secretary, Bodleian Library, Oxford University; Professor D. Nichol Smith, Oxford University; Mr. R. W. G. Vail, Librarian, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts; Mr. George P. Winship, Assistant Librarian, and Mrs. William B. Allen, Acting in Charge of Treasure Room, Harvard College Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Miss Fava E. Goan, Assistant Reference Librarian, Indiana University, Bloomington; and Professor Emeritus A. L. Bouton, New York University, New York City.

Professor Ernest Bernbaum, to whom I have been indebted since my earliest venture into Defoe problems, has been a generous friend and counselor in this one. To the wisdom and learning of Professor Phineas L. Windsor, Director, University of Illinois Library, of Professor George Sherburn, Columbia University, and of my colleague, Professor T. W. Baldwin, I have turned frequently. Another colleague, Dr. Brice Harris, has run down numerous references for me in these last hectic days. The collaboration at several points of Professor Theodore F. M. Newton, McGill University, has been mentioned but not sufficiently. Professor Newton, whose knowledge of some phases of the *Review* is probably unparalleled among active Defoe students, has been from the inception of the project helpful and sympathetic. Finally, I am indebted to Miss Evelyn Boyce of the Columbia University Press, who after my departure from New York in February carried on for me long and intricate inquiries in the texts.

Others who have contributed in various ways not mentioned hitherto are Professor James R. Sutherland, Birkbeck College, University of London; Professor E. G. Fletcher, University of Texas; Professor J. J. Parry, who shares an office with me at the University of Illinois and

could not avoid being sapped of information; and Professor J. R. Moore, Indiana University.

My wife, Minta Tenney Secord, has had a keen eye for the pedantry and dullness which have been a constant menace and which have not been curbed as completely as she hoped. And, as a gesture of reconciliation with my family, I should like to mention their patience during a very long detachment.

A. W. S.

Urbana, Illinois
July 30, 1938

Bibliographical Note (Volume I)

COPIES

BM-b lacks Preface and Contents.

BM-c

Bou is in storage, but it is reported to have the five supplements and may be otherwise complete.

Ha lacks title page, Preface, Appendix, Contents, and supplements.

I lacks title page, Preface, Nos. 1, 11, 28, 59–67, and 84, Appendix, Contents, and supplements.

O

S

Sm has Nos. 1–40, 83–100, and 102 and the five supplements.

Te-1

Te-2 lacks the last leaf (pp. [vii–viii]) of the Preface and Appendix, Contents, and supplements.

Tr-d

Tr-l

Trent. The Trent Collection has Nos. 28, 92–98, and 101.

Y lacks Appendix, Contents, and supplements.

The five monthly supplements are variously placed. In Tr-d they are interpolated after the numbers of the *Review* for the corresponding month; in Te-1 they precede, and in BM-c and S they follow, the Appendix and Contents. Since they are textually independent of the *Review*, none having appeared in the month for which it is dated, and since they are included in the Contents, the most logical and convenient arrangement seems to be that of Te-1. Accordingly, they have, in this edition, been placed just before the Appendix and Contents.

COLLATION

S, Te-1, Te-2, Tr-d, and Y have been carefully collated, and the general features of BM-b, BM-c, Ha, I, O, Sm, and Tr-l, checked.

A complete Volume I consists of [viii] + 424 + [132] (supplements) + [32] (Appendix and Contents) pages.

a) Title page (verso blank), pp. [i–ii].

Preface, pp. [iii–vii]. Page [viii] is blank.

The preliminary, pp. [i–viii], a whole sheet in 4to (signature A), was

not, like later preliminaries, published as a regular issue of the *Review* between the last number of the old volume and the first of the new. Though no advertisement of it has come to light, it must have been printed prior to June 27, 1705, by which time the whole volume, bound, was promised. See Volume II, Nos. 46 and 49–50.

b) Nos. 1–102; Sat., Feb. 19, 1704 (1703/4)—Sat., Feb. 24, 1705 (1704/5).

Pagination: 1–136, 135–138, 141–247, 428, 249–327, 324, 329–424.

Signatures: A-D in fours, E-5 K in twos, as follows: A—[S]—[Ss]—Rrr, Ss, Ttt—Yyy, Aaaa-5 A, Bbbb, 5 C-5 D, 5 D-5 E, F 5, 5 G-5 K. J, V, and W are, of course, not used. But see Bibliographical Note to Volume II in Facsimile Book 4.

Colophon: Nos. 1–4, "Printed for the *Booksellers* of *London* and *Westminster*. 1704"; Nos. 5–87, MDCCIV; Nos. 88–102, MDCCV.

Issued weekly (Nos. 1–6) in whole sheets (Nos. 1–4) and biweekly (Nos. 7–102) in half-sheets (Nos. 5–102), 4to.

Beginning with No. 2 there appears a section of entertainment and correspondence entitled, *Mercure Scandale* . . . The long caption, after alterations in Nos. 3 and 6, dwindles in No. 18 to "Advice from the Scandalous Club" and in No. 46 to "Advice from the Scandal. Club." After overflowing into supplements later in Volume I and in Volume II, the Advice gives way in Volume III to the Miscellanea, which deals with graver subjects.

c) Monthly supplements, Sept., 1704–Jan., 1705 (1704/5). September supplement, with title page (verso blank), pp. [1]—28, issued on Oct. 21. See *Review,* No. 66.

Pagination: [1]–17, 17–18, 20–21, 21–22, 24–28. This series of errors is a result of one error; the printer, in signature C, gave the first leaf verso the pagination of the recto, and so vitiated the whole series in the inner form.

Signatures: A-C in fours, D in twos.

Colophon: none. *FINIS,* on p. 28, is followed by advertisements.

October supplement, with title page (verso blank) slightly altered from the preceding, pp. [1]–28, issued on Nov. 25. See *Review,* No. 76.

Pagination: [1]–28. Signatures and colophon are as in the preceding supplement.

November supplement, with title page (verso blank), pp. [1]–28, issued on or before Jan. 23, 1705. See *Review,* No. 93. The pagination, signatures, and colophon are as in the preceding.

December supplement, with title page (verso blank), pp. [1]–28, issued on March 10, 1705. See Volume II, No. 4.

Pagination in S: [1]–10, 14, 12-28. In Te-1 and Tr-d: [1]–10, 14, 12–16, 9–16, 25–28. In these two, sheet C is paged as though it were B. On p. 17, S* lacks the first letter of "Just," the first word in the final paragraph.

Signatures and colophon are as in the preceding.

January supplement, with title page (verso blank), pp. [1]–28[20], issued on May 5. See Volume II, No. 27.

Pagination: [1]–5, 7, 6, 8–16, 25–28[20].

Signatures: A-B in fours, D in twos. There is no sheet C, but the text is complete.

d) Appendix and Contents, published as a unit, in 32 unnumbered pages, on or about June 27, 1705. See Volume II, Nos. 46, 49, and 50.

Appendix, with title page (verso blank), pp. [1–16]. It is an abstract of the French laws against dueling, which Defoe had promised his readers.

Contents, pp. [17–32]. The Contents of the supplements has a separate caption [p. 30], in which "ADVICE" is misspelled "AVICE."

Signatures: A-D in fours.

Colophon: none.

NOTES ON TEXT

No. 1. The *Review* began with eight pages in single columns, published weekly on Saturdays. The long caption, briefer than that on the volume title page, means that the affairs of France are also the affairs of England. Note the modifications of the caption in Volumes II–IV and [IX].

No. 1 begins with "*The* INTRODUCTION," which is followed (on p. 7) with "SECTION I. *Of the* French *Nation.*" The colophon (p. 8), with no indication of the printer, reads: "Printed for the *Booksellers* of *London* and *Westminster.* 1704." Parts of it are unprinted in S and Tr-d.

No. 2, p. 15, has the first "*Mercure Scandale:* OR, ADVICE from the Scandalous CLUB. Translated out of *French.*"

No. 3, p. 23, alters the title of the *Mercure Scandale* by omitting the last clause and substituting, "BEING, *A Weekly History of* Nonsense, Impertinence, Vice *and* Debauchery."

No. 4, p. 32, gives the first clue to the printer by announcing that advertisements "are taken in" by J. Matthews in Pilkington Court, Little Britain.

The first advertisements appear in this issue, p. 32. S, Te-1, Te-2,

Tr-d, and Y* have the heading *"ADVERTISEMENT"* followed by the advertisement of "Union to the Church of *England*." But Te-1 and Y* have a second advertisement in two parts, obviously inserted after printing had begun.

No. 5. With this issue Defoe reduced his paper from eight pages to four, partly to economize and partly to circumvent the sellers who, because of the success and the unusual size of the *Review*, had raised the price to two pence. Statements in Volume [IX], No. 1, and elsewhere indicate that the usual price was a penny. To compensate for the change in size, Defoe used smaller type in double columns. Thereafter through Volume VIII, the *Review* consisted of four pages. A single exception was Volume VIII, No. 19.

Among the other changes in No. 5, the colophon was altered to read MDCCIV.

No. 6, p. 39, shortens the caption of the *Mercure Scandale* by omitting all after "Club" and, p. 40, gives the first list of errata.

No. 7, March 28, is the first Tuesday issue; thereafter till Volume II, No. 8, the *Review* appeared twice a week.

No. 8 drops "Weekly" in the caption.

No. 18 lacks the signature S and reduces the caption of the secondary section to a single line: "Advice from the Scandalous Club."

No. 25, p. 115, cites *Smectymnuus* and *Mack Fleckno* in defense of using Scandalous Club as a proper name.

No. 31. Pages [137–140] are mispaged 135–138, but No. 32 is paged correctly (141–144).

No. 33, p. 147, has a notice in the Advice that the printer had mistakenly reported having matter enough for the preceding issue.

No. 36 is said to be misnumbered 35 in I but is correct in S*, Te-1, Tr-d, and Y. In Te-2 the numeral has been trimmed beyond identification.

No. 41 lacks the signature Ss.

No. 46 abbreviates "Scandalous Club" to "Scandal. Club."

No. 48, p. 207, brings the author before his own Scandal. Club for an historical error, caused by trusting to his memory.

No. 58, p. 247, announces that monthly supplements will care for the overflow from the "Advice from the Scandal. Club." Page [248] is paged 428.

No. 60, Sept. 30. In Tr-d the September supplement follows p. 256. That supplement, however, did not appear till Oct. 21. See No. 66. In this edition, as in Te-1, the supplements are near the end of the volume, before the Appendix and Contents.

No. 64. The signature Sss is misprinted Ss. Page 271 announces that the (September) supplement at press is inadequate and that another will follow in three weeks.

No. 66, Oct. 21, p. 279, announces the (September) supplement as published that day.

No. 67. In S the "b" and the numeral is missing from "Numb. 67."

No. 69, Oct. 31, has the signature Aaaa. There is no sheet Zzz. In Tr-d the October supplement follows p. 292. See note on No. 60.

No. 76, Nov. 25, announces the October supplement as published that day.

No. 77, Nov. 28. In Tr-d the November supplement follows p. 324. See note on No. 60.

No. 78. Page [328] is mispaged 324.

No. 84, p. 352. A note printed in the margin is partly trimmed away in Te-1, Te-2, Tr-d, and Y but is untrimmed in S*.

No. 86, Dec. 30. In Tr-d the December supplement follows p. 360. See note on No. 60.

No. 88, Jan. 6, 1705, p. 368, announces a delay in the November supplement, the author "having for some time been *very Ill.*" The colophon replaces MDCCIV with MDCCV.

No. 93. Signature 5 B is misprinted Bbbb. S keeps the dating of No. 92 and (p. 385) misprints "Enttiled" for "Entitled" in col. 2, line 1, and "Thep" for "they" at the foot of col. 2. A list of errata (p. 388) explains that the author was "very Sick, and out of Town, when the two last *Reviews,* and the *Supplement*" were printed.

No. 95, Jan. 30, 1705. In Tr-d the January supplement follows p. 396. See note on No. 60.

No. 96 repeats the signature (5 D) of No. 95.

No. 98. Signature 5 F is misprinted F 5.

No. 100, Feb. 17, 1705, begins, "This being the last *Review* of this Volume, and *design'd to be so of this Work,*" but three pages later (p. 416) announces two more papers and a preface and index to complete the volume. Finally, we are told, several gentlemen have "made some very Honourable Proposals" which the author has digested "into a Form of Subscription" which may be seen at Mr. Matthew's.

Apparently Defoe intended to close the volume, not because it had reached a hundred numbers, but because it had run a year. The threat to discontinue the paper is rightly regarded as Defoe's warning to Harley, who perhaps was in arrears of promises, that if he wished the *Review* to continue he must contribute to its support.

No. 102, Sat., Feb. 24, 1705. Here again Defoe begins as though he were writing his last paper. But Volume II opened with No. 1 on Tues., Feb. 27, 1705.

CHECK LIST

All pages, except those listed below, are from Tr-d.

T. p.	S	90–91	Y	228–229	Te-2	380–381	Y
Pref.	Y	92–93	S	230–231	S	386–389	S
1	Y	96–97	Y	234–237	S	390–391	Te-2
2–3	S	104–105	S	240	Y	392–394	Y
4–5	Y	108	Y	242–243	S	395–399	S
6–7	S	110–111	Y	246–247	Y	400–401	Te-2
8–9	Te-1	112–113	S	257	Te-2	402–403	S
10–19	S	116–117	S	258–259	Y	410–411	Y
20–21	Te-1	118–119	Y	260	Y	418–421	Y
22–25	Te-2	120–133	S	266–267	Y	422–423	Te-2
26–27	S	[138–139]		268–269	Te-2	November	
28–29	Y	mispaged		277–279	S	Supplement	
30–31	S	136–137	S	282–283	S	[1]–2	S
32–33	Y	144–145	Y	284–285	Y	3	Te-1
34–35	S	150–162	S	288–293	Y	4–9	S
36–37	Te-2	165	Y	305	Te-2	12–13	S
38–42	S	166–167	S	308	Te-2	16–18	S
43–45	Y	168	Y	322–323	S	19	Te-1
46–49	Te-2	169–171	S	330–331	Te-2	20–28	S
50	Y	173	Y	341–343	Te-2	December	
52	Y	174–175	Y	345	Te-2	Supplement	
53	Te-1	180	S	348–352	S	[1]–28	S
60–63	S	182–185	Y	353	Te-2	Appendix and	
66–67	Y	186–187	S	354–357	Y	Contents	
68–71	S	188–192	Y	358	Y	[1–9]	S
76–79	Y	194–195	S	360	Te-2	[10–15]	Te-1
80–81	S	198–203	S	361	S	[16]	S
82–83	Y	204–207	Y	364–369	Te-2	[17–19]	S
84–85	S	208–212	S	370–371	S	[25]	S
86–87	Y	213–215	Y	373	S	[26–27]	Te-1
88–89	S	216–219	S	379	S	[28–29]	S

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A = American Antiquarian Society Library
BA = Boston Athenæum Library
BM-b = British Museum, Burney Collection
BM-c = " " Crossley, in North Reading Room
Bou = Bouton, Professor Emeritus, A. L., Library of
E = Edinburgh or Edinburgh issue
Ha = Harvard College Library
Hu = Henry E. Huntington Library
I = Indiana University Library
L = London or London issue
M = McGill University Library
N = National Library of Scotland
O = Oxford University, Bodleian Library, Hope Collection
S = Shaw, Mr. Arch W., Library of
S-t = *Defoe Tracts:* a collection of 22 numbers of Vols. VII and VIII in Mr. Shaw's library
Sm = Smith, Professor D. Nichol, Library of
Te = University of Texas Library: Vols. II–IV, VI–VII
Te-1 = " " " " Vol. I only
Te-2 = " " " " " " " Te-2 has brown leather binding and the signatures of James T. Bell, John Clarkson, and John Clarkson, Junior.
Tr-d = Trent Collection, Boston Public Library, Vols. I–II, V–VII with signatures of Benj. Dobels (*sic*) and Susanna Edwards
Tr-l = Trent Collection, Boston Public Library, Vols. I–II with bookplate of Henry Labouchere
Tr-m = Trent Collection, Boston Public Library, Vols. IV–[IX] purchased from Maggs in 1919
Y = Yale University Library: Vols. I–III, V–VI
Y-1 = " " " Vol. VII only
Y-2 = " " " " " " Y-2 has "1885" on the Yale Library bookplate.

An asterisk with one of these symbols indicates the copy of a particular page or number used in this reprinting.

A

REVIEW

OF THE

Affairs of FRANCE:

AND OF ALL

EUROPE,

As Influenc'd by that NATION:

BEING,

Hiſtorical Obſervations, on the Publick Tranſactions of the WORLD; Purg'd from the Errors and Partiality of *News-Writers*, and *Petty-Stateſmen* of all Sides.

WITH AN

Entertaining Part in every Sheet,

BEING,

ADVICE from the Scandal. CLUB,

To the Curious Enquirers; in Anſwer to Letters ſent them for that Purpoſe.

LONDON:
Printed in the Year MDCCV.

THE PREFACE

When Authors present their Works to the World, like a Thief at the Gallows; they make a Speech to the People.

The Author indeed has something like this to say too, Good People all take Warning by me; ——— *I have studied to Inform and to Direct the World, and what have I had for my Labour, Profit, the* Press *would not allow; and therein I am not deceiv'd, for I expected none.*

But Good Manners and Good Language, I thought I might expect; because I gave no other; and it was but just to Treat Mankind, as they would be Treated by them.

But neither has this been Paid me, in Debt to Custom and Civility——— How often have my Ears, my Hands, and my Head, been to be pull'd off,——— Impotent Bullies, that Attackt *by Truth, and* their Vices storm'd, *fill the Air with Rhodomontades and Indecencies, but never shew'd their Faces to the Resentment Truth had a just Cause to Entertain for them.*

I have pass'd through Clouds of Clamour, Cavil, Raillery and Objection, and have this satisfaction, that Truth being the Design; Finis Coronat: *I am never forward to value my own Performances,* Let another Man's Mouth Praise thee, *said the Wise Man; but I cannot but own my self infinitely pleas'd, and more than satisfied; that Wise Men Read this Paper with Pleasure, own the just Observations in it, and have Voted it Useful.*

The first Design, I allow is not yet pursu'd, and indeed I must own, the Field is so large, the Design so vast, and the necessary Preliminaries so many; that tho' I cannot yet pass for an Old Man, I must be so, if I live to go thorough with it.

This Volume has pass'd through my Description of the French *Grandeur, with its Influence on the Affairs of* Poland, Sweden, *and* Hungary.

What Assaults I have met with, from the Impatience of the Readers, what Uneasiness of Friends, lest I was turn'd about to the Enemy; I leave to their Reading the Sheets to discover.

The PREFACE.

How is this Age Unqualifi'd to bear Feeling Truth; how unwilling to hear, what we do not like, tho' never ſo neceſſary to know!

And yet if this French *Monarchy was not very Powerful, vaſtly ſtrong, its Power Terrible, its increaſing encroaching Meaſures formidable; why do we, and juſtly too, Applaud, Extol, Congratulate, and Dignifie, the Victorious Duke of* Marlbourough *at ſuch a Rate? If it had been a mean and Contemptible Enemy, how ſhall we juſtifie the* Engliſh *Armies March thro' ſo many hazards; the Nations vaſt Charge, the daily juſt Concern, in every Article of this War; and as I have frequently hinted, why not beat them all this while?*

They who have made, or may make an ill uſe of the true Plan of French *Greatneſs which I have laid down, muſt place it to the Account of their own Corrupted prejudic'd Thoughts; my Deſign is plain, to tell you the Strength of your Enemy, that you may fortifie your ſelves in due Proportion, and not go out with your Ten Thouſands againſt his Twentys.*

In like manner, I think my ſelf very odly handled in the Caſe of the Swedes *and* Hungarians, *how many Complaints of Ambaſſadors for one, and Fellow-Proteſtants for the other; and yet after the whole Story is finiſhed, I have this Felicity, than which no Author can deſire a greater,* viz. *not one thing I ever affirm'd but was exactly true; not one Conjecture I have made, but has appear'd to be rational; not one Inference drawn, but the Conſequences have prov'd juſt; and not one thing gueſs'd at, but what has come to paſs.*

I am now come home to England, *and enter'd a little into our own Affairs; indeed I have advanc'd ſome things as to Trade, Navys, Seamen, &c. which ſome may think a little arrogant, becauſe perfectly new. But as I have offer'd nothing but what I am always ready to make appear practicable, I finiſh my Apology with ſaying to the World,* Bring me to the Teſt, and the reſt I leave to time.

In the bringing the Story of France *down to the matter of Trade, I confeſs my ſelf ſurprizingly drawn into a vaſt Wilderneſs of a Subject, ſo large, that I know not where it will end; the Misfortune of which is, that thinking to have finiſh'd it with this Volume, I found my ſelf ſtrangely deceiv'd, and indeed amazed, when I found the Story of it intended to be the End of this Volume, and hardly enough of it entred upon to ſay, it begun.*

However the Volume being of Neceſſity to be cloſed, I am oblig'd to content my ſelf with taking what is here as an Introduction to the next Volume, and to give this Notice, that the matter of our Engliſh *Trade appears to be a thing of ſuch Conſequence to be treated of, ſo much pretended to, and ſo little underſtood, that nothing could be more profitable to the Readers, more advantageous to the publick Intereſt of this Nation, or more ſuitable to the Greatneſs of this Undertaking, than to make an Eſſay at the Evils, Cauſes, and Remedies of our general* Negoce.

The PREFACE.

I have been confirm'd in my Opinion of the Conſequences and Benefit of this Undertaking by a Croud of Entreaties from Perſons of the beſt Judgment, and ſome of extraordinary Genius *in theſe Affairs, whoſe Letters are my Authority for this Clauſe, and whoſe Arguments are too forcible for me to reſiſt.*

And this is to me a ſufficient Apology for a vaſt Digreſſion from the Affairs of France, *which were really in my firſt Deſign; and to which my Title at firſt too ſtreightly bound me.*

Whoever ſhall live to ſee this Undertaking finiſhed, if the Author or ſome better Pen after him, ſhall bring 20 *or* 30 *Volumes of this Work on the Stage, it will not look ſo prepoſterous as it ſeems now, to have one whole Volume be employ'd on the moſt delightful as well as profitable Subject of the* Engliſh *Trade.*

Things at ſhort Diſtances look large, and publick Patience is generally very ſhort; but when remote, the Caſe alters, and People ſee the Reaſon of things in themſelves.

'Tis this remote Proſpect of Affairs which I have before me; and this makes me not ſo much regard the Uneaſineſs People ſhew at the Story, being frequently broken abruptly, and running great Lengths before it revolves upon it ſelf again; but as time and the Courſe of things will bring all about again, and make the whole be of a Piece with it ſelf, I am content to wait the Approbation of the Readers, till ſuch time as the thing it ſelf forces it from the at preſent Impatient Readers.

Readers are ſtrange Judges when they ſee but part of the Deſign; 'tis a new thing for an Author to lay down, his Thoughts, Piece-Meal, importunate Cavils aſſault him every Day, who claim to be anſwer'd to Day before to Morrow; and are ſo far from ſtaying till the Story is finiſh'd, that they can hardly ſtay till their Letters come to Hand; but follow the Firſt with a Second, that with Clamour, and this ſometimes with threatning Scoffs, Banters and Raillery.

Thus I am Letter baited by Queriſts, and think my Trouble to write civil, private Anſwers to teazing and querulous Epiſtles, has been equal, if not more troubleſome, than all the reſt of this Work.

Thro' theſe Difficulties, I ſteer with as much Temper and Steadineſs as I can, I ſtill hope to give Satisfaction in the Concluſion; and 'tis this alone that makes continuing the Work tollerable to me; if I cannot, I have made my Eſſay. If thoſe that know theſe things better than I, would bleſs the World with farther Inſtructions, I ſhall be glad to ſee them, and very far from interrupting or diſcouraging them, as theſe do me.

Let not thoſe Gentlemen who are Criticks in Stile, in Method or Manner, be angry that I have never pull'd off my Cap to them in humble Excuſe for my looſe Way of treating the World as to Language, Expreſſion, and Politeneſs of Phraſe; Matters of this

Nature

The PREFACE.

Nature differ from most things a Man can write: When I am busied writing Essays, and Matters of Science, I shall address them for their Aid, and take as much Care to avoid their Displeasure as becomes me; but when I am upon the Subject of Trade, and the Variety of Casual Story, I think my self a little loose from the Bonds of Cadence and Perfections of Stile, and satisfie my self in my Study to be explicit, easie, free, and very plain; and for all the rest, Nec Careo, nec Curo.

I had a Design to say something on the Entertaining Part of this Paper; but I have so often explain'd my self on that Head, that I shall not trouble the World much about it.

When I first found the Design of this Paper, which had its Birth in Tenebris; *I consider'd it would be a thing very Historical, very long, and tho' it could be much better perform'd than ever I was like to do it; this Age had such a Natural Aversion to a Solemn and Tedious Affair, that however Profitable, it would never be Diverting, and the World would never Read it.*

To get over this Difficulty that secret hand, I make no Doubt that directed this Birth into the World, Dictated to make some sort of Entertainment, or Amusement at the end of every Paper upon the immediate Subject, then on the Tongues of the Town, which Innocent Diversion, would hand on the more weighty and Serious Part of the Design, into the heads and Thoughts of those, to whom it might be useful.

I take this Opportunity to assure the World, that Receiving or Answering Letters of Doubts, Difficulties, Cases and Questions, as it is a Work I think my self very meanly qualifi'd for, so it was the remotest thing from my first Design of any thing in the World; and I could be heartily Glad, the Readers of this Paper would excuse me from it yet,—— But I see it cannot be, and the World will have it done; I have therefore done my best to oblige them, but as I have not one Word to say, for my Performance that way, so I leave it where I found it; a meer Circumstance, casually and undesignedly annex'd to the Work and Curiosity, tho' Honestly Endeavour'd to be comply'd with.

If the Method I have taken in answering Questions, has pleas'd some wiser Men than I expected it would; I confess 'tis one of the chief Reasons why I was induc'd to continue it. I have constantly adher'd to this Rule in all my Answers, and I refer my Reader to his Observation for the Proof, that from the loosest and lightest Questions, I endeavour to draw some useful Inferences, and if possible to introduce something solid, and something solemn in applying it.

The Custom of the Antients in writing Fables, is my very Laudable Pattern for this, and my firm Resolution in all I write to exalt Vertue, expose Vice, promote Truth, and help Men to serious Reflection, is my first moving Cause, and last directed End.

If

The PREFACE.

If any ſhall make ill Uſe of, wreſt, wrong interpret, wilfully or otherwiſe miſtake the honeſt Deſign of this Work, let ſuch wait for the End, when I doubt not the Author will be clear'd by their own Vote, their Want of Charity appear, and they be Self-condemn'd, till they come to acknowledge their Error, and openly to juſtifie

Their Humble Servant,

D. F.